

# Idaho Annual Performance Report

FFY 2011

Submitted to:  
U.S. Department of Education  
February 12, 2013  
Revised May 15, 2013

[http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special\\_edu/performance\\_plan.htm](http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special_edu/performance_plan.htm)

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Table of Contents

<b>Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:</b> .....	2
<b>Indicator 1</b> .....	3
<b>Indicator 2</b> .....	12
<b>Indicator 3</b> .....	19
<b>Indicator 4</b> .....	31
<b>Indicator 5</b> .....	43
<b>Indicator 6</b> .....	47
<b>Indicator 7</b> .....	51
<b>Indicator 8</b> .....	63
<b>Indicator 9</b> .....	72
<b>Indicator 10</b> .....	77
<b>Indicator 11</b> .....	82
<b>Indicator 12</b> .....	88
<b>Indicator 13</b> .....	94
<b>Indicator 14</b> .....	112
<b>Indicator 15</b> .....	126
<b>Indicator 16</b> .....	144
<b>Indicator 17</b> .....	145
<b>Indicator 18</b> .....	146
<b>Indicator 19</b> .....	147
<b>Indicator 20</b> .....	152
<b>Attachment 1: Part B Indicator 15 Worksheet</b> .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

### **Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

For the February 2013 submission of Idaho's Annual Performance Report, data was shared with a variety of stakeholders and input was elicited regarding targets and improvement activities for the new indicators and revisions to activities for other indicators. Input was received from the Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel, the Early Childhood Interagency Work Group including Part B and C stakeholders and parents of preschoolers, the Idaho Interagency Secondary Council including community partners, individuals with disabilities, higher education, and others, the Idaho Parent Information Center, and the Monitoring Work Group including special education directors from all regions of the state.

### **Reporting Results to the Public**

Idaho reports annually in February to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP and the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP. Idaho's Annual Performance Report (APR) is posted on the State website at: [http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special\\_edu/performance\\_plan.htm](http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special_edu/performance_plan.htm).

In February, reports on the performance of each district against the state targets are posted at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/SpecialEd/DDR/SPEDPortal.asp>. Notification of the posting is disseminated through the SDE monthly newsletter. In addition, a formal report is made annually to the Idaho State Board of Education, LEA superintendents, special education directors, school boards, the Special Education Advisory Panel, the Idaho Interagency Secondary Council, and at conferences and meetings throughout the year.

## Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Generating a graduation rate for all subgroups under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires collaboration between three SDE divisions: Information Technology, Public School Finance, and Special Education. Public School Finance collects data with the assistance of Information Technology. Special Education assists in ensuring the data are clean by comparing it to special education data sources and resolving differences with districts reporting conflicting data in Attendance and Enrollment compared to Child Count or Exiting Data. Information Technology uses the clean data to generate graduation rates for all subgroups for reporting under ESEA.

The Special Education Advisory Panel was provided with the data and provided feedback on the State Plan, priorities, activities, and targets.

A monitoring workgroup comprised of District special education directors from both charter and traditional school districts met three times during the year to review data, processes and procedures, and to provide input for improvement and additional training needs.

The SDE continues to solicit suggestions, and insights from these groups were extremely valuable to the development of the SPP/APR.

### Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

#### Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Measurement:

States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

**ESEA formula for graduation in Idaho:** [(number of graduates), divided by the (number of graduates plus the number of dropouts from the cohort group over the four years of high school)]. This same formula applies to all students and subgroups, including students with disabilities.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011	90%	87.3%

**Data Source:** Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Special Education Graduates			Cohort Dropouts	
2010-2011 Graduates	662		Grade 12	34
			Grade 11	20
			Grade 10	22
			Grade 9	20
			<b>Total Dropouts</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Graduation Rate = <math>[662/(662+96)] = 87.3\%</math></b>				

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Four-Year Comparison of Graduation Rates

FFY	Graduation Rate
2007	81.4%
2008	76.7%
2009	88.8%
2010	89.2%
2011	87.3%

Data are reported from every district for the 2010-2011 school year. The target of 90% is the same annual graduation rate target under Title I of the ESEA for all subgroups, including students with an IEP.

Graduation rates are one piece of data that Districts must respond to in writing with their school and district improvement plans. During the self-assessment process, Districts must look for root causes of poor performance on this indicator and plan activities to improve their graduation rate for students with disabilities, if they failed to meet the rigorous goal. They may review and revise the improvement plan annually, as needed, based on their performance data.

### Conditions all Idaho youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma:

The conditions that Idaho youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma (for students who enter high school at the 9<sup>th</sup> grade level in Fall 2009 or later) include 29 credits for core instruction, 17 credits for electives, a Postsecondary Readiness Plan completed at the end of 8<sup>th</sup> grade, and a score of proficient or advanced in reading, math, and language usage on the Idaho State Achievement Test. In addition, Idaho allows for an alternate mechanism, to be used for all students, if they do not achieve a score of proficient or advanced in reading, math, and language usage, however, they must follow an appeal procedure in their local school district. The alternate mechanism or alternate pathway must meet IDAPA Rules Governing Thoroughness 08.02.03 in which 90% of the criteria of the measure(s) must be based on academic proficiency and performance, the measure(s) must be aligned to a minimum of 10<sup>th</sup> grade content standards and aligned to subject matter, and the measure(s) must be valid and reliable. For students with disabilities on IEPs, in order to meet their individual needs to demonstrate achievement, if accommodations or adaptations are made to the District and State's regular graduation requirement, including the Idaho State Achievement Test, the IEP team shall document them in the IEP.

### College Entrance Exam:

A student must take one (1) of the following college entrance examinations before the end of the student's eleventh grade year: COMPASS, ACCUPLACER, ACT or SAT.

### Senior Project:

A student must complete a senior project by the end of grade twelve (12).

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

**Slippage:** Idaho's actual target data for the graduation rate for students with disabilities is 87.3%, down from 89.2% the prior year, and Idaho did not reach the rigorous ESEA target of 90%. Idaho has been without a lead position to address all issues concerning high school completion. The SDE has established a new director position to address student engagement and post-secondary readiness. This director will

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

work with ESEA and SPED divisions to target technical assistance for districts with greatest needs. Additional improvement activities, as described below, are also being added to help meet the SDE targets.

The SDE has seven regional coordinators assisting districts with instructional and compliance issues. The regional coordinators provided 45 districts with technical assistance specific to retention and graduation in FFY 2011.

Not captured in the data are the increasing numbers of students (approximately 1.5% in the 2010-2011 SY compared to 1.4% in 2009-2010) staying in the secondary education system into their fifth, sixth, and seventh years of high school to continue with special education programs and work towards a diploma.

In a continued partnership with Boise State University Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies (CSI&PS), the SDE provides technical assistance to districts & schools classified in one of the stages of Needs Improvement, as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act. Technical assistance to these districts & schools includes the provision and coordination of professional development; fostering collaboration; and the enhancement of regional, district, and school capacities to better serve students.

The SDE continues to use the Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE) Tool to assist LEAs improve services to all students and improve graduation rates. The WISE Tool has many support features built into the tool that provides schools and districts with best practice research linked to the areas used for planning.

FFY	Improvement Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Collaborate with the AT (Assistive Technology) Project to offer the "Tools for Life Conference" for high school students with disabilities	March 2012	Tools for Life number of attendees: 320 (33 educators, 124 students, 52 family members, 79 professionals, 11 vendors, 13 college mentors, 8 self-advocate adults) Tools for Life had 13 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about self-determination. Tools for Life had 5 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about self-advocacy. Tools for Life had 7 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about community living. Tools for Life had 11 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about employment. Tools for Life had 11 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about postsecondary education and assistive technology.
2011	Sponsor the Youth Leadership Forum to develop leadership abilities of SWD and encourage them to take an active role in community leadership	Discontinued	Youth Leadership Forum was not provided because of the lack of funding and manpower needed to support the forum. The forum only provides participation to a small number of students.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

			<p>Instead, regional Disability Advocacy Day training workshops were held</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 10, Idaho Falls</li> <li>• November 17, Coeur d'Alene</li> <li>• December 1, Twin Falls</li> <li>• December 8, Boise</li> </ul>
2011	<p>Focus on RTI at secondary level with screeners for both academics &amp; behavior. Collaborate with the Secondary Administrator Association on use of the Warning System as a screening method at the HS level to identify students at risk.</p>	<p>September 2012 – January 2013</p>	<p>Trained 244 secondary educators in multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS). The content areas trained upon were mathematics, SWPBIS, writing, and reading. Mathematics and SWPBIS were implemented in teams of 5 with a coach and building principal with 5-6 days of training depending on the content. The reading and writing trainings were two-day sessions on implementing a plan of how to enhance the MTSS content area of reading and writing. Trainings were held regionally.</p> <p>Partnered with the National Center on RTI, the state was begun the work of training districts on the Early Warning System.</p> <p>Some high schools have begun the work of implementing an Early Warning System.</p> <p>Regional trainings provided throughout the state each year.</p> <p>Partnered with the Pesky Center on appropriate tools to screen high school students. AIMSweb Probes (R-CMB, Maze-Reading; Spelling, timed writing prompts-Writing Expression; MCAP, MCOMP-Math), for Secondary Schools.</p> <p>In September, OSEP provided another grant opportunity and we were awarded the grant on October 1<sup>st</sup> that focuses on secondary school development of an early warning system.</p> <p>We are also partnering with Neuhaus, who has created a more effective screener and diagnostic assessment for secondary students. The first institution is tentatively scheduled for the end of January.</p>
2011	Continue to support the Post-Secondary Disability	May 2012	Quarterly meeting (September, January,

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	Service Office for the purpose of building effective supports for youth with disabilities in post-secondary settings & to work with high schools to prepare SWD for post-secondary education.		<p>April, June) set with IICST (Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition). Includes representatives from: Disability Services from state universities, and community colleges and the State Department of Education.</p> <p>Group members used post-school data to help develop a timeline and graduation guidance document that is available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse. Group members also provided Disability Mentoring Day in 3 regions of the state with 122 student participants attending.</p>
2011	Revise and update the "Moving On" binder. The binder was created to help students and their families as they plan for transition from school.	Electronic version completed in March 2012. Revised version completed in January 2013	<p>The Assistive Technology Project has created an electronic version of the Moving on Binder to increase accessibility. It was added to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse in March 2012. <a href="http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx">http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx</a></p> <p>150 copies of the Binder were disseminated in paper form at the Tools for Life conference and 50 binders were passed out at the Boise transition fair. Data was collected that indicate that 6 school districts have a direct link to the binder on the district website.</p> <p>The hard copy of the Moving on Binder's content was updated in January 2013.</p> <p>The electronic version of the Moving on Binder needs to have the content updated to match the hard copy.</p>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Collaborate with the Idaho AT (Assistive Technology) Project to offer "Tools for Life" annual conference for secondary students with disabilities to provide information on post-secondary options and planning, developing self-determination skills, &	March 2013	Part B Funds AT Project Funds SDE Secondary Special Education Coordinator	<p>Helps prepare students with disabilities for college and career readiness</p> <p>NSTTAC (National Secondary Transition Technical</p>



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	networking for students with disabilities, their families & professionals working with them.			Assistance Center) conducted a literature review that identified more than 15 evidence-based predictors of post-school employment, education, and independent living success from the correlational research. The Tools for Life conference provide instruction in 8 of these 15 evidenced-based practices: career awareness, community experiences, interagency collaboration, parental involvement, self-advocacy/self-determination, self-care/independent living skills, social skills, and vocational education.
2012	Sponsor the Youth Leadership Forum to develop leadership abilities of SWD and encourage them to take an active role in community leadership	Discontinued	Discontinued	The Idaho State Department of Education is not able to commit to sponsoring Youth Leadership Forum because of the lack of funding and manpower needed to support the forum. The forum only provides participation to a small number of students and the data has indicated that a very percentage of secondary students on IEPs graduation rate are increased through the

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				sponsorship of this forum.
2012	Focus on RTI at secondary level with screeners for both academics & behavior. Collaborate with the Secondary Administrator Association on use of the Warning System as a screening method at the HS level to identify students at risk.	Feb-May 2013	SDE Secondary Special Education Coordinator, SDE RTI Coordinator, OSEP grant on secondary school development of an early warning system, Part B Funds SIG	The need for effective screener and diagnostic assessment for secondary students has been a focus for many states. Working with Neuhaus will help improve the assessments used by secondary students for screening and diagnostic assessment. This assessment will be used as a part of the Early Warning Systems for secondary students. Early Warning Systems identify and monitor students at risk of dropping out of high school. The process is based on research about data-driven decision making. The process helps make informed decisions about how to support at-risk students and how to monitor process over time. The process provides information on specific supports, interventions, and/or successes and identifies systemic issues that may relate to drop-out.
2012	Continue to support the Post-Secondary Disability Service Office for the purpose of building effective supports for youth with disabilities in post-secondary settings & to work with high schools to	Meet 3 times a year	SDE Secondary Special Education Coordinator Part B Funds	Helps prepare students with disabilities for college and career readiness  NSTTAC (National

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	prepare SWD for post-secondary education.			<p>Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center) conducted a literature review that identified more than 15 evidence-based predictors of post-school employment, education, and independent living success from the correlational research. Disability mentoring day and commissioning an Interagency Council that supports transition to adult services embraces 5 of these 15 evidenced-based practices: career awareness, community experiences, interagency collaboration, parental involvement, and vocational education.</p>
2012	Revise and update the "Moving On" binder.	May 2013	Interagency Council SDE Secondary Special Education Coordinator Part B Funds	<p>The Moving On binder is a planning tool that includes resources to help students to organize documents that they may need for adult services, getting the support they need at college, or to get a job.</p> <p>Need to include current contact information, websites, and resources.</p> <p>Need to increase accessibility of the</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				<p>content in the Moving on Binder.</p> <p>Conley (2012) extended the college readiness components to four keys to college and career readiness. One of these components is key transition knowledge and skills including planning for post-secondary education and careers.</p>
2012	<p>To increase proper coding of graduating students the SDE will work with the IT department to develop and train district staff on proper coding of graduation in the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) program.</p>	<p>March 2013 – September 2013</p>	<p>Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator</p> <p>Chief Information Officer</p> <p>IT program analyst</p> <p>Part B Funds</p>	<p>The ISEE program is the SDE tool for all district data submissions on students. In order to have usable data that easily can be retrieved at a later stage for further comparison and analysis, the SDE needs to be sure school districts are inputting the data correctly. Proper coding will provide the SDE with information on systemic concerns regarding graduation rates.</p>

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Dropout rates are reported annually to school districts. In their monitoring self-assessment process, they must explore the root cause of dropout rates that fail to meet the state goal and write an improvement plan to address the underlying issues. These plans may be revised annually, as needed, based on new data.

Input is gathered from a variety of stakeholders. The Special Education Advisory Panel, including a wide array of stakeholders, receives a presentation and report on all indicators in the Fall meeting. Discussion and input follows. A Special Education Workgroup meets at least twice a year to consider data for the indicators and provide input and recommendations. Data are presented at standing conferences such as Idaho Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Special Education Directors Conference, Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA) Annual Conferences, Idaho Association of Secondary School Principals (IASSP) and as many others as possible, with broad stakeholder input solicited. Recommendations are taken into consideration as improvement planning occurs.

### Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

### Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source and Measurement:

Per OSEP memo 13-6 in the APR writing packet, Idaho has chosen the option to report indicator 2 “using the same data source and measurement that the State used for its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012 ESEA dropout event rate: [(number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12 who dropped out) **96**, divided by the (total number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12) **6507**] times 100].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011 (SY 2010-2011 data)	2.1%	1.5%

### 4-Year Comparison of Dropout Rates

FFY	Number of Dropouts	Number of SWD in Grades 9-12	Dropout Rate
2007	184	7,059	2.6%
2008	152	6,710	2.3%
2009	94	6,870	1.4%
2010	83	6,866	1.2%
2011	96	6,507	1.5%

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Data were reported from every school and district for the 2010-2011 school year. Validation checks were implemented and curious data resolved.

### Definition of a dropout:

The same definition for a dropout is used for all Idaho youth, including students with disabilities on IEPs. A dropout is an individual who was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year, and who does **not** meet any of the following conditions:

- Graduation from high school or completion of a State or District approved educational program, or
- Transfer to another public school district, private school, or State or District approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), or
- Temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or
- Death.

### Explanation of Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

**Slippage:** At 1.5%, Idaho's dropout rate increased by 0.3% over the previous year's data of 1.2%. Even with slippage, the rigorous target of less than 2.1% was met. The SDE continues to provide technical assistance to districts through webinars and collaboration between the secondary special education coordinator, district special education directors, School Improvement, and Gear Up programs. Additionally, the SDE has established a new director position to address student engagement and post-secondary readiness. This director will work with ESEA and SPED divisions to target technical assistance for districts with greatest needs.

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Collaborate with general education data specialists and Computer Services to use the longitudinal data system to track a specific student's enrollment, dropout, or graduation status for reporting dropouts for ESEA.	Ongoing	The Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator have been assisting the general education data specialists and Computer Services to improve on the exit data school districts are uploading to the state data management system. Updates were added to the ISEE system and monitoring continues.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2011	Use the comprehensive improvement plan outlined in the WISE tool to coordinate with general education efforts statewide to reduce dropout rates in districts' for all students including the subgroup of special education students.	Ongoing	We have increased the number of Wise Tool Indicators to include many areas that support secondary school success, which would include addressing the dropout rate of students. School level Indicators VA (01- 03, 07-10) specifically address the school's leadership team to examine individual and collective student data, which includes early warning systems and behavior monitoring for at-risk students for dropping out. District Indicators (IA06,07,15 and IC06 and 09) are not as specific but are there to support schools in having system support for data analysis.
2011	Collaborate with the school improvement team to increase emphasis on reducing dropout rates in the school and district improvement plans by requiring inclusion of scientifically research-based interventions found in WISEWAYS.	Ongoing	We have increased the number of Wise Tool Indicators to include many areas that support secondary school success, which would include addressing the dropout rate of students. Indicators IID12-15 addresses having scientifically research-based curriculum with a multi-level system of prevention and support for all students which, combined with data analysis of individual and collective groups of students, will address the at-risk populations including dropouts.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2011	Collaborate with the School Improvement Team to support statewide dropout prevention efforts to include students with IEPs. Continue work on the WISEWAYS tool specific to services and supports for SWD.	Ongoing	We have increased the number of Wise Tool Indicators to include many areas that support secondary school success, which would include addressing the dropout rate of students. Indicator IIIA07 addresses differentiated needs of all students based on individual student assessments. There is not a specific prevention effort for students with IEPs, except that the system that the Wise Tool supports is for data analysis and implementation of supports for “all” students to be successful and reach their potential. SEA encourages schools and districts implement the WISE tool as revised, to identify and target students at risk of dropping out.
------	---	---------	---



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>2012</b>	Collaborate with general education data specialists and Computer Services to use the longitudinal data system to track a specific student's enrollment, dropout, or graduation status for reporting dropouts for ESEA.	Ongoing	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator IT Division State funds	Nearly one-third of all high school students leave the public school system before graduating (Swanson, 2004), and the problem is particularly severe among students of color and students with disabilities (Greene & Winters, 2005; U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Using a longitudinal analysis of students' dropout and graduation patterns can lead to the development of Early Warning Systems to identify those greatest at-risk of dropping out and create supports to decrease these risks.
<b>2012</b>	Coordinate with general education efforts statewide to reduce dropout rates in districts for all students including the subgroup of special education students as outlined in one comprehensive improvement plan in the WISE Tool.	Ongoing	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Director of Student Engagement and Postsecondary Readiness Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Regional Coordinators Part B funds	The WISE Tool has many support features built into the tool that provides schools and districts with best practice research linked to the areas used for planning. Technical assistance is offered to districts identified as 1, 2, and possibly 3 star schools (star ratings are partially determined based on dropout and

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				graduation rates). These districts & schools include the provision and coordination of professional development; fostering collaboration; and the enhancement of regional, district, and school capacities to better serve students.
<b>2012</b>	Collaborate with the school improvement team to increase emphasis on reducing dropout rates in the school and district improvement plans by requiring inclusion of scientifically research based interventions found in WISEWAYS within the WISE Tool.	Ongoing	Director of Student Engagement and Postsecondary Readiness  Regional Coordinators  Part B funds	The WISE Tool allows the district, the school, and the leader to know where they are in relation to a success indicator. It also provides evidence-based guidance on what practices and interventions can be used to move a district or school closer to the success indicator.
<b>2012</b>	Collaborate with the school improvement team to support statewide dropout prevention efforts to include students with IEPs.	Ongoing	Secondary Special Education Coordinator  Director of Student Engagement and Postsecondary Readiness  Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator  Regional Coordinators  Part B funds	Nearly one-third of all high school students leave the public school system before graduating (Swanson, 2004), and the problem is particularly severe among students of color and students with disabilities (Greene & Winters, 2005; U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Focuses efforts on students greatest at-risk of dropping out and creating supports to decrease these risks

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				will reduce dropout rates for all students.
<b>2012</b>	To increase proper coding of graduating students the SDE will work with the IT department to develop and train district staff on proper coding of dropouts in the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) program.	September 2013	<p>Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator</p> <p>Chief Information Officer</p> <p>IT program analyst</p> <p>Part B Funds</p>	<p>The ISEE program is the SDE tool for all district data submissions on students. In order to have usable data that easily can be retrieved at a later stage for further comparison and analysis, the SDE needs to be sure school districts are imputing the data correctly. Proper coding will provide the SDE with information on systemic concerns regarding dropout rates to help identify target districts to implement the Early Warning Systems.</p>

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:**

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "N" size that meet the State's AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs, against grade level, and modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

- A. AMO percent =  $\left[ \frac{(\# \text{ of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AMO targets for the disability subgroup})}{(\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size})} \right] \text{ times } 100$ .
- B. Participation rate percent =  $\left[ \frac{(\# \text{ of children with IEPs participating in the assessment})}{(\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math})} \right]$ . The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent =  $\left[ \frac{(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards})}{(\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math})} \right]$ . The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Targets and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:**

<b>FFY 2011</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Targets</b>									
	<b>Districts Meeting AMO for Disability Subgroup (3.A.)</b>		<b>Participation for Students with IEPs (3.B.)</b>				<b>Proficiency for Students with IEPs Continuously Enrolled (3.C.)</b>			
Targets for FFY 2011	71%		Reading		Math		Reading		Math	
			95%		95%		66.04%		61.28%	
Actual Target Data for FFY 2010 (SY2010-2011)	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	9 out of 62	14.5%	13,189 out of 13,421	98.3%	13,178 out of 13,419	98.2%	6,245 out of 12,323	50.7%	4,972 out of 12,317	40.4%
<b>Actual Target Data for FY 2011 (SY 2011-2012)</b>	13 out of 111*	11.7%	14,066 out of 14,302	98.3%	14,079 out of 14,314	98.4%	10,870 out of 14,066	77.2%	9,399 out of 14,079	66.8%

**\*number of districts counted in 3A increased because minimum “N” size changed from 34 to 25 due to approval of the Idaho ESEA waiver.**

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**3.A: Actual AMO Target Data for FFY 2011:**

Districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "N" size AND met the State's AMO target for the disability subgroup.

FFY	Total Number of Districts	Number of Districts Meeting the "N" Size	Number of Districts That Met the Minimum "N" Size and Met AMO for FFY 2011	Percent of Districts
2010 (SY2010-2011)	141	62	9	14.5%
2011 (SY2011-2012)	149*	111	13	11.7%

\*The Idaho Department of Corrections is excluded from the district count because their students do not participate in statewide testing.

**3.B.: Actual Participation Target Data for FFY 2011:**

**Disaggregated Actual Target Data for Math Participation**

Statewide Assessment – 2011-2012		Math Assessment								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10	Total	
									#	%
a	Children with IEPs	2217	2238	2346	2154	2006	1806	1547	14,314	100%
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	819	713	670	589	550	484	484	4309	30.6%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1201	1297	1464	1355	1219	1104	844	8484	60.3%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	standards									
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	157	195	192	179	208	182	173	1286	9.1%
	<b>Overall Baseline (b+c+d+e+f)</b>	<b>2177</b>	<b>2205</b>	<b>2326</b>	<b>2123</b>	<b>1977</b>	<b>1770</b>	<b>1501</b>	<b>14,079</b>	<b>98.4%</b>
*Children included in "a" but not included in the other counts above*										
	Account for any children with IEPs that were not participants in the narrative.	40	33	20	31	29	36	46	235	1.7%

**Disaggregated Target Data for Reading Participation**

Statewide Assessment – 2011-2012		Reading Assessment								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10	Total	
									#	%
a	Children with IEPs	2212	2238	2347	2151	2005	1807	1542	14,302	100%
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2014	1995	2124	1919	1757	1583	1326	12,718	88.9%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2	16	7	18	11	10	3	67	0.47%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
f	IEPs in alternate assessment	156	195	194	178	208	182	171	1,284	09.0%

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	against alternate standards									
	<b>Overall Total (b+c+d+e+f+g)</b>	<b>2172</b>	<b>2206</b>	<b>2325</b>	<b>2115</b>	<b>1976</b>	<b>1775</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>14,069</b>	<b>98.4%</b>
*Children included in "a" but not included in the other counts above*										
Account for any children with IEPs that were not participants in the narrative.		40	32	22	36	29	32	45	236	1.7%

**3.C.: Math Disaggregated Actual Performance Target Data for FFY 2011:**

Statewide Assessment — 2011-2012		Math Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10	#	%
a	Children with IEPs	2,177	2,205	2,326	2,123	1,977	1,770	1,501	14,079	100%
b	IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	772	657	559	480	360	366	285	3479	24.7%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	897	890	801	757	536	560	368	4809	34.1%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	129	167	172	152	181	154	139	1094	0.8%
	<b>Overall Total (b+c+d+e+f)</b>	<b>1798</b>	<b>1714</b>	<b>1532</b>	<b>1389</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>792</b>	<b>9382</b>	<b>66.6%</b>



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**3.C.: Reading Disaggregated Actual Performance Target Data for FFY 2011:**

Statewide Assessment – 2011-2012		Reading Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10	#	%
a	Children with IEPs	2,172	2,206	2,325	2,115	1,976	1,775	1,497	14,066	100%
b	IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	1446	1523	1525	1468	1373	1292	1063	9690	68.8%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1	11	4	11	9	6	2	44	0.3%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	138	181	183	155	180	158	141	1,136	8.1%
	<b>Overall Total (b+c+d+e+f)</b>	<b>1585</b>	<b>1715</b>	<b>1712</b>	<b>1634</b>	<b>1562</b>	<b>1456</b>	<b>1206</b>	<b>10,870</b>	<b>77.2%</b>

**Public Reporting Information:** [http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special\\_edu/publicReporting.htm](http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special_edu/publicReporting.htm)  
<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/assessment/ISAT/results.htm>

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

**3.A.:** The Idaho State Department of Education received an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver in 2012 (<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/esea/>). Idaho will be using an Achievement Annual Measureable Objective (AMO) with the following targets:

Subject	Current AMO for AYP	2011-2012 Goal	2012-2013 Goal	2013-2014 Goal
Reading	85%	85%	86%	88%
Mathematics	83%	83%	84%	86%

The State's minimum "n" size  $\geq 25$  for calculation and  $\geq 10$  for reporting. 111 of the 149 districts in Idaho meet the minimum "n" size. 13 of the 111 districts achieved AMO for 2011-2012.

**3.B.: Progress:** Participation in reading remained the same over the last two years 98.3% in FFY 2010 and FFY 2011. In math, a 0.2% gain was made from 98.2% in FFY 2010 to 98.4% in FFY 2011. The ESEA target of 95% for all students was met and exceeded.

Reasons for Students Not Participating in ISAT	Reading	Math
Absent	14	19
Medical Exemption	23	23
Exempt	5	6
Other reasons	207	206
Invalid score	4	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>241</b>

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
"The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school levels with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities	The SDE has published the required data at the following links: <a href="http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special_edu/publicReporting.htm">http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special_edu/publicReporting.htm</a> <a href="http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/assessment/ISAT/results.htm">http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/assessment/ISAT/results.htm</a>

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the district and school levels. Also, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on grade level academic achievement standards, at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.”	The SDE is currently working to build a single website for public reporting. The Quality Assurance & Reporting Coordinator is working with Information Technology to write the business requirements and launch the website by the beginning of SY 2013-2014. Redirection linkage will be available on the old sites.
--	---

**3.C.: Math Proficiency – Progress:** The FFY 2011 performance of 66.6% proficient or better in math is an improvement over the performance of students in FFY 2010. The rigorous target of 61.28% was met.

**3.C.: Reading Proficiency – Progress:** The FFY 2011 performance of 77.2% of special education students scoring proficient or better in reading is from 50.7% the previous year. The rigorous target 66.04% was met.

### Statewide Efforts - Idaho Math Initiative:

In 2007, the Idaho Legislature allocated \$350,000 in seed money for the State Department of Education to develop the Idaho Math Initiative with the goal to improve math education in all grades so we can ensure every student is prepared for higher levels of math in the middle grades, high school, and post-secondary and work force settings.

With a goal of identifying and remediating struggling students earlier, the Department piloted a new math assessment for grades K-2 since many schools did not have a measure for student performance in math in the early grades. The state fully implemented the new assessment in FFY 2009.

The Math Standards subcommittee worked diligently on defining and designing standards that are aligned with national standards as well as meeting business and post-secondary expectations and addressing the increased graduation requirements. The standards have been adopted by the State Board of Education.

The Idaho Math Initiative focuses strongly on professional development to give teachers in Idaho the tools they need to raise student achievement in math across all grades. As part of the Math Initiative, the State developed a three-credit core course that all math teachers, including elementary teachers and school administrators, will be required to take by 2015 in order to recertify. As incentive, the State paid the cost of the course for all teachers during the first year it was offered. The SDE is also working to develop a Math Specialist Certificate for teachers who specialize in math. In order to ensure teachers have the resources they need close by, the State trained six regional math specialists who provide professional development and continued support to teachers locally.

Intervention tools for the Idaho Math Initiative include *Apangea*, an online resource that may be accessed by students during school, at home, and even over the summer break. It can serve as a second math class for struggling students, provide additional practice opportunities, or furnish challenge and advancement for higher performing students.

More information on the Idaho Math Initiative may be found at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/math/>

### Statewide Efforts in Reading:

Improving the capacity of teachers to provide quality instruction, progress monitoring, and effective interventions has been a statewide focus. For two years, the SDE provided training of trainers on *Next STEPS: Fluency Measures and Teaching Struggling Readers to Read*. It focuses on using scientifically

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

based reading assessments to identify and monitor at-risk students. Teachers learned how to use data to create instructional reading groups and to plan data informed interventions in order to obtain high levels of early reading achievement by utilizing the latest research findings. For the past year, those trainers continued training others in their districts.

To improve teachers' skills in using benchmark assessments and progress monitoring, the SDE reading coordinator teamed with the RTI coordinator to offer 90-minute webinars to districts on the use of *AIMSweb*, which the State provides for progress monitoring for all students in grades K-2. These webinars are archived and posted on the SDE website so they may be accessed at any time.

During 2010-2011, 17 days of regional *AIMSweb* training was offered. It was organized into three courses (beginning, intermediate, advanced) and made available to the 94 districts who applied for the use of *AIMSweb* licenses to use for progress monitoring of at-risk or special education students. In addition to that we had 77 districts (550 people) participate in the fall Module 1 training on Screening.

### **Other Statewide Efforts Impacting AYP/AMO and Student Achievement:**

#### **Statewide System of Support:**

The Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) project is a new system of support for Idaho schools and districts that are in "Needs Improvement" status. Based on a needs assessment that indicated a need for increased support and technical assistance to Idaho schools and districts in needs improvement status, additional federal grant funds were obtained to jump start a pilot project to establish a state wide system of support in Idaho. The pilot project (Cohort I) began in January 2008 and served 19 sites for a three year period. The project provided scaffold support designed to assist Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in building their own internal capacity to sustain their school improvement efforts. A rigorous school and district selection process has been developed, with a goal to select schools and districts that are in needs improvement status and serve a high percentage of at-risk students (combined percentage of economically disadvantaged, migratory, English language learners, and students with disabilities) and have limited local resources.

This project has been very successful in turning around failing schools and was featured by the Center on Innovation and Improvement in "*Transforming a Statewide System of Support: The Idaho Story*". Because schools often fail to make AYP/AMO due to their subgroup of students with disabilities, special education plays a key role in our Statewide System of Support by participating on teams that visit schools and conduct instructional reviews, including instruction delivered during interventions and in resource rooms. Data is left with the school to address in their improvement plans.

In 2010-2011, 39 districts and 66 schools were participating in the IBC. A new Cohort began in January 2012.

#### **Idaho's Comprehensive Literacy Plan**

Idaho's Birth to grade 12 (B-12) Literacy Plan promotes a standards based Common Core (CC) literacy approach that incorporates the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) into all classrooms and educational environments. The Common Core State Standards are higher standards in mathematics and English language arts that serve as the foundation of the 21 Century Classroom. With these standards and proper implementation, the state will ensure every student graduates from high school prepared to go on to postsecondary education or the workforce without the need for remediation once they get there. The Idaho State Comprehensive B-12 Literacy Plan builds upon the college-and-career/post-secondary-and-workforce ready literacy expectations for 21st century learners. The plan was developed with input from Special Education (Early Childhood), Response to Intervention, and the SDE Director of Special Education.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The Comprehensive Literacy Plan can be found at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/strivingReaders/docs/Idaho%20State%20B-12%20Literacy%20Plan%20September%202012.pdf>

### **Idaho Reading Initiative (IRI)**

The Idaho Reading Initiative, enacted by the Idaho Legislature, was designed to ensure that all children in the State of Idaho will master the skills they need to become successful readers. Endless research-based studies show reading skills are directly related to a child's success in school. It is our goal as the State Department of Education to work with schools, teachers, and administrators to promote students' reading success! Idaho Statute 33-1614 requires K-3 students in Idaho to be assessed as they develop critical reading skills. The purpose of the assessment, the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI), is to indicate which children are most likely going to be at-risk of failure with skills that are prerequisite for being successful readers throughout life. As is written in the statute, the state K-3 assessment test results shall be reviewed by school personnel for the purpose of providing necessary interventions to sustain or improve the students' reading skills.

### **Capacity Builders (CBs):**

A key component of this statewide system of support is the utilization of recently retired, highly distinguished educators that are trained by the State to assist school and district leaders as they facilitate the work of school improvement in Idaho's neediest schools and districts. Capacity Builders (CBs) are assigned to a school or district site within the IBC network. They are provided with monthly training and given guidance on the work of school improvement. However, the IBC project does not prescribe to a cookie-cutter approach to school improvement. Capacity Builders are provided with a "tool kit" of school improvement resources, and then in partnership with school and district leaders, help create and implement a customized school improvement plan. During the 2010-2011 school year, retired, distinguished special education directors were added to the CB project for added support to districts with the most challenges due to their special education subgroup.

### **Regional Expansion of IBC:**

The coordination for the Idaho Building Capacity project was initially located at the Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies (CSI & PS) at Boise State University (Southwestern Region). Regional IBC Support Centers have also been established at the University of Idaho (Northern Region) and Idaho State University (Southeastern Region) and began serving sites statewide in February 2009. While individual centers have been created in each region, there will be a uniform and systematic approach for delivering services, in order to establish continuity in the statewide system of support. The coordination of IBC regional centers will operate through the Idaho State Department of Education and the State School Improvement Coordinator. The three regions combined will be serving 28 sites representing Cohort II, 36 sites representing Cohort III, and 41 sites representing Cohort IV. With all cohorts combined, 105 sites are currently being served in the IBC project. Cohort V began in January 2012.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

#### Statement from the Response Table

The State did not report publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on grade level academic achievement standards, at the State, district, and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

#### State's Response

The SDE has published the required data at the following link:  
[http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special\\_edu/publicReporting.htm](http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special_edu/publicReporting.htm)

The SDE is currently working to build a single website for public reporting. The Quality Assurance & Reporting Coordinator is working with Information Technology to write the business requirements and launch the website by the beginning of SY 2013-2014. Redirection linkage will be available on the old sites.

#### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	New teacher training: Include progress monitoring and research-based curriculum and interventions.	September 2012 through January 2013	New teacher training was completed by SDE and Regional staff. This is an ongoing activity
2011	Charter school training on interventions, RTI and continuum of services.	Summer 2012	The SDE provided trainings including AIMSWEB training and RTI Module 1 (Screening).
2011	Review district AYP/AMO data reports and identify districts with low test participation and/or performance for students with disability subgroup and provide technical assistance specific to identified need(s), including onsite visits.	Fall 2012 and ongoing throughout the year	Division of Assessment uses their assessment monitoring tool to track LEAs and arrange technical assistance. Regional Coordinators provided 25 consultations specific to ISAT testing.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	New teacher training: Include progress monitoring and research-based curriculum and interventions.	September 2012 (Annual Activity)	SDE and Regional staff Part B Funds	Often new special education teachers lack these necessary skills.
2012	Charter school training on interventions, RTI and continuum of services.	Summer 2012 (Annual Activity)	SpEd Charter Coordinator Part B Funds	By better preparing charter school staff, the needs of SWD will be met. That is expected to improve their academic performance.
2012	Review district AYP/AMO data reports and identify districts with low test participation and/or performance for students with disability subgroup and provide technical assistance specific to identified need(s), including onsite visits, if needed.	Fall 2011 and ongoing throughout the year	SDE Data Coordinator, Quality Assurance Coordinator SDE Regional Consultants VI-B funds Title I funds State funds	Assist in identifying barriers to participation and provide assistance to improve participation.
2012	Provide training and technical assistance in scientifically research based practices in reading, math, and progress monitoring.  Collaborate with Title 1 and SDE content areas to support current SDE math and reading initiatives and the Response to Intervention (RTI) project.	March 2013	SDE RTI Coordinator Title 1 SDE Regional Consultants Title I funds Part B funds	Needed to increase participation levels and performance levels for SWDs.
2012	Provide technical assistance and support to school personnel on how to read, understand and use student data to make adjustments to teaching and interventions, including use of SchoolNet.	Fall 2012 and ongoing	RTI Coordinator Monitoring & Data Coordinators Regional Consultants VI-B funds	Need to increase performance of SWDs.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The State Department of Education collects 618 discipline data from each district on the number of suspensions and expulsions. These data was reviewed for significant discrepancies according to the definition included below and based on the number of students enrolled with IEPs in each district. Results were shared with stakeholders and the Special Education Advisory Panel for comments and input.

### Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

### Indicator 4a Rates of suspension and expulsion:

Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy *from other LEAs within Idaho* in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

#### Data Source:

Data on suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities is derived from 618 data submitted by every school in the state through a secure web-based data system. Verification checks are built into the system to ensure the reliability and accuracy of the data as it is submitted.

### Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology:

The SDE re-defined and recalculated significant discrepancy in April 2012 as a result of the Office of Special Education APR clarification process. The e-formula was replaced with a state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities to set the suspension/ expulsion-rate bar measure. The state bar is the state level suspension / expulsion rate plus one percentage point.

In Idaho, “Significant discrepancy” is defined as 1% or more above the current year’s state average by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

That is, the total number of students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled divided by the total number of students with disabilities **in the state**. The formula is:

$$\text{State level suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{\text{\# of SWDs suspended/expelled} > 10 \text{ days}}{\text{Total \# of SWDs in the state}} \times 100$$



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Applying data:

$$\text{State level suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{45}{27,388} \times 100 = 0.16$$

**The state bar is 0.16% + 1.00 = 1.16%.**

A district will have significant discrepancy if its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any racial/ethnic group is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.16% for FFY 2010 data.

For Indicator 4a, Idaho has established a **minimum “n” size** of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in the school district. Based on the application of this minimum “n,” 16 of 150 districts in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for this indicator in FFY 2011.

### Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (using 2010-2011 data):

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2010-2011 data)	0%

### LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion

FFY	Total Number of LEAs*	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies	Percent
2011 (2010-2011 data)	134 *(150 – 16 = 134)	0	0%

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Six-Year Comparison

Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual Performance
2004	0.87%		
2005		0%	1%
2006		0%	2.4%
2007		0%	0%
2008		0%	0%
2009		0%	0%
2010		0%	0%
2011		0%	0%

#### Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

**Progress:** Idaho met the target of 0% on this indicator with no districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days during the 2010-2011 school year. Statewide, 45 students from 24 districts were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days; compared to the same number of students (45) students suspended or expelled the previous year from 9 districts (2009-2010). As in previous years, most of these suspensions occurred at high schools or middle schools. Monitoring results from other activities conducted in schools where suspensions and expulsions occurred, showed no issues with development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Having no disputes or expedited hearings filed regarding this issue is also evidence that proper procedures are occurring in the districts.

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices:

No district showed a significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices in its rate of suspensions and expulsions, compared to other LEAs within the State.

#### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:

No noncompliance was identified in the FFY 2010 for this indicator. As reported in previous APRs, all previously identified noncompliance has been verified as timely corrected.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:**

<b>Statement from the Response Table</b>	<b>State's Response</b>
<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>OSEP is unable to determine whether the State used a minimum "n" size requirement, and whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size.</p>	<p>Idaho uses a minimum "N" size. For Indicator 4a, Idaho has established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in the school district. Sixteen (16) of 150 districts in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for this indicator in FFY 2011</p>

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

With broad input from stakeholders improvement activities reviewed and revised. Stakeholders included involvement of representatives from local education agencies, the State, Idaho Parents Unlimited, and the Special Education Advisory Panel that included individuals with disabilities who were former students, parents, educators, private providers, corrections, and State representatives.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 4b Rates of suspension and expulsion:**

Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Measurement:**

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards)}}{\text{(\# of districts in the State)}} \right] \times 100$ .

**Data Source:**

Suspension and expulsion **data** are reported by all Idaho schools via the Data Upload secure web site and the data are collected on Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-0621 (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year —2010-2011 due, November 1, 2011.

**Note:** Idaho uses a minimum “N” size. A School District with less than 10 students on every race/ethnicity category will not be included in the analysis. 16 districts out of the 150 school districts in the state were not included in the analysis.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

**Definition of Significant Discrepancy**

The SDE re-defined and recalculated significant discrepancy in April 2012 as a result of the Office of Special Education APR clarification process. The e-formula was replaced with a state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities to set the suspension/ expulsion-rate bar measure. The state bar is the state level suspension / expulsion rate plus one percentage point.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

In Idaho, “Significant discrepancy” is defined when a district has a suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any racial/ethnic group is one (1) percentage point or more than the state mean suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities. That is, the total number of students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled divided by the total number of students with disabilities. The formula is below:

State Bar = State Mean level suspension/expulsion rate + 1 percentage point

$$\text{District: District suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{\# of SWDs from any racial/ethnic group} \\ \text{suspended/expelled > 10 days} \end{array}}{\text{Total \# of SWDs in the District}} \times 100$$

A district will be considered to have “significant discrepancy” if it has a suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any racial/ethnic group that is one (1) percentage point or more than the state mean suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities.

### Applying data:

$$\text{State level suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{45}{27,388} \times 100 = 0.16$$

**The state bar is 0.16% + 1.00 = 1.16%.**

A district will have significant discrepancy if its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any racial/ethnic group is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.16% for FFY 2010 (using 2010-11 data). For FFY 2010, six (6) districts demonstrated significant discrepancy compared to nine (9) in FFY 2009.

For Indicator 4b, Idaho has established a **minimum “n” size** of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in the school district. Based on the application of this minimum “n,” 16 of 150 districts in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for this indicator in FFY 2010.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Actual Target Data for FFY 2010 (using 2010-2011 data)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2010 (using 2010- 2011 data)</i>	<i>0.0%</i>

*For this indicator, report data for the year before the reporting year (using 2009-2010 data).*

<i>0.0%</i>
-------------

### Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

**Maintenance:** Idaho met the target of 0% on this indicator with no districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities based on race/ethnicity for greater than 10 days during the 2010-2011 school year. Statewide, 45 students were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, the same number as students suspended or expelled the previous year (2009-2010). Most of these suspensions occurred at high schools or middle schools. Monitoring results from other activities conducted in schools where suspensions and expulsions occurred, showed no issues with development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Having no disputes or expedited hearings filed regarding this issue is also evidence that proper procedures are occurring in the districts.

### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices:

No district showed a significant discrepancy in its rate of suspensions and expulsions, compared to other LEAs within the State. Therefore, no further review of policies, practices, and procedures was required, although there is an established process in place should that occur in the future.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:**

**Table 4B – Rates of Suspension and Expulsions of Students with Disabilities per School District and per Race Ethnicity that are above the State Bar of 1.16%**

District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Indian	Islander	Two or more	White	Grand Total
A							0.04%	0.04%
B							3.45%	3.45%
C				0.08%	0.08%			0.16%
D							0.81%	0.81%
E			0.35%					0.35%
F							2.33%	2.33%
G							0.25%	0.25%
H		0.10%	0.10%				0.20%	0.40%
I			0.21%				0.14%	0.35%
J			1.96%					1.96%
K							0.17%	0.17%
L							0.25%	0.25%
M							0.70%	0.70%
N							0.37%	0.37%
O							0.38%	0.38%
P							0.26%	0.26%
Q							0.57%	0.57%
R							2.44%	2.44%
S							3.06%	3.06%
T				1.04%				1.04%
U			0.65%				2.58%	3.23%
V			0.14%				0.41%	0.55%
W							0.95%	0.95%
X							0.68%	0.68%
Grand Total	0.00%	0.10%	3.41%	1.12%	0.08%	0.00%	20.04%	24.75%

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### 4B(a). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity	Percent**
FFY 2011 (using 2010-2011 data)	134 *(150 – 16 =134)	6	4.5%

### 4B(b). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Year	Total Number of Districts*	Number of Districts that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	Percent**
FFY 2011 (using 2010-2011 data)	134 *(150 – 16 =134)	0	0.00%

### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices

For each of the six (6) districts identified as having a significant discrepancy based on the examination of 2010-2011 data, the Idaho State Department of Education reviewed the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

This review was conducted by the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator (QARC) during focused visits with the districts. The monitoring included reviewing the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The QARC also conducted a review and analysis of 1) the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) current at the time of



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

the discipline actions; 2) discipline records and reports specific to the suspension and/or expulsion of the student; 3) functional behavior assessments; 4) manifestation determinations; and 5) the districts discipline policy. No findings of noncompliance were made based on these reviews.

If noncompliance had been identified during the review of policies, procedures and practices, the SDE would have required the district to revise its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). Idaho verifies correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>4A:</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>OSEP is unable to determine whether the State used a minimum "n" size requirement, and whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size.</p> <p>4B</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide data based on the required measurement for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State did not report that it conducted the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure</p>	<p>4A</p> <p>Idaho uses a minimum "N" size. For Indicator 4a, Idaho has established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in the school district. Sixteen (16) of 150 districts in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for this indicator in FFY 2011.</p> <p>4B</p> <p>The SDE re-defined and recalculated significant discrepancy in April 2012 as a result of the Office of Special Education APR clarification process. The e-formula was replaced with a state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities to set the suspension/ expulsion-rate bar measure. These recalculated data are presented above.</p> <p>Idaho uses a minimum "N" size. A School District with less than 10 students on every race/ethnicity category will not be included in the analysis. . Sixteen (16) of 150 districts in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for this indicator in FFY 2011.</p> <p>For each of the nine districts identified as having a significant discrepancy based on the re-examination of 2009-2010 data, the Idaho State Department of Education reviewed the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

<p>that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b). The failure to conduct the review required in 34 CFR §300.170(b) is noncompliance.</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report correction of this noncompliance by describing the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, for any districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>Further, in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data) and FFY 2011 (using 2010-2011 data) for this indicator.</p>	<p>This review was conducted by the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator (QARC) during focused visits with the districts. The monitoring included reviewing the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The QARC also conducted a review and analysis of 1) the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) current at the time of the discipline actions; 2) discipline records and reports specific to the suspension and/or expulsion of the student; 3) functional behavior assessments; 4) manifestation determinations; and 5) the districts discipline policy. No findings of noncompliance were made based on these reviews.</p> <p>Data for FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 are included above.</p>
--	--

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010

For thirteen consecutive years, the SDE has funded the Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions (PBIS) project through the University of Idaho that provides training and supports for teachers with the most challenging students. These efforts have been scaled up from problem solving at the student level to school-wide training and now to district-wide training. The SDE is currently in the process of incorporating PBIS components into the state RTI Initiative that is rapidly proliferating across the state. As educators gain skills in handling challenging behaviors, we are seeing a reduction in the number of students suspended or expelled.

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed that occurred in FFY 2011:

2011	Consult with stakeholders regarding replacement of e-formula for both 4A and 4B.	Spring 2012	SDE replaced e-formula for both 4A and 4B. Established a minimum "n" size of 10 for both 4A and 4B
2011	Continue funding the PBIS project.	July 2011-June 2012	Funding was secured for the 13 <sup>th</sup> consecutive year.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2011	Provide district support grants with expected outcomes in Year 2: District team and first cohort of school teams • Tier 2 trainings: systems, data, and practices • TA for coaches w/ second cohort of school teams • District tier 2 infrastructure	Sept. 2011– June 2012	Nine trainings took place between September 2011 and June 2012. Webinars were also offered by the SDE and Idaho Training Clearinghouse.
2011	Collaborate with IT to integrate discipline data into the longitudinal data system	Summer 2012	Discipline data now collected in the ISEE system effective July 1, 2012

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Provide multiple years of PBIS technical assistance.	Sept. 2012 – June 2013	Part B funds PBIS personnel Regional Consultants	PBIS has a proven track record of decreasing discipline referrals and actions
2012	Continue funding the PBIS project	July 2012- June 2013	SSOS PBIS staff VI-B funds	PBIS has a proven track record of decreasing discipline referrals and actions
2012	Multi-year Supports – Year 3: District team and first cohort of school teams • Tier 3 trainings: systems, data, and practices • TA for coaches w/ second & third cohort of school teams • District tier 3 infrastructure	Sept. 2012- June 2013	Part B funds PBIS personnel	PBIS has a proven track record of decreasing discipline referrals and actions

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:**

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

**Targets and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:**

<b>Educational Placement Data for FFY 2011</b>	<b>Education Environment</b>	<b>Special Education Setting Count<sup>1</sup> (a)</b>	<b>Special Education Child Count, ages 6-21<sup>2</sup> (b)</b>	<b>Educational Placement Percent %=(a/b)*100</b>
5A	Served inside the Regular Class $\geq$ 80% of the day	14249	23485	<b>60.7%</b>
5B	Served inside the Regular Class < 40% of the day	2653	23485	<b>11.3%</b>
5C	Served in Separate Facilities <sup>3</sup>	316	23485	<b>1.3%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Special Education Setting Count is reported annually with the December 1 Special Education Child Count data collection and includes students with disabilities, ages 6-21.

<sup>2</sup>Special Education Child Count is the annual December 1 Special Education Child Count data collection and includes students with disabilities, ages 6-21.

<sup>3</sup>Separate Facilities include a count of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Year to Year Comparison</b>	<b>&gt;80% of day</b>	<b>&lt;40% of day</b>	<b>Separate</b>
<b>FFY</b>	<b>5.A.</b>	<b>5.B.:</b>	<b>5.C.</b>
2004	58.2%	9.0%	1.6%
2005	63.8%	8.0%	1.6%
2006	61.8%	8.7%	1.8%
2007	62.5%	9.4%	2.0%
2008	63.3%	9.3%	1.6%
2009	62.8%	9.4%	1.4%
2010	62.3%	10.8%	1.7%
2011	60.7%	11.3%	1.3%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:**

**Slippage on Indicator 5.A.:** Idaho's LRE placement fell 1.6% for FFY 202011 compared to the previous year. The rigorous target of 64% was missed by 3.3%.

The slippage appears to be the result of identification of students with more significant learning needs particularly in the categories of Autism, Other Health Impairment, Emotional Disturbance, and Multiple Disabilities. Overall, the number of students, age 6 to 21, reported on Child Count decreased from 23,793 to 23,485 students. Autism, Language Impairments, and Other Health Impairment are growing categories.

**Slippage on Indicator 5.B:** On Indicator 5.B, the State performance fell from 10.8% last year to 11.3% this year. The rigorous target of 7.9% was missed. The majority of students receiving services in the less than 40% time in regular environments consist of five categories: Cognitive Impairment, Autism, Multiple Disabilities, Emotional Disturbance, and Other Health Impaired (8.3%). The increased identification of children with Autism and the unique needs these children have may explain the increase in this placement. Also, data suggests movement from separate facilities back to the schools. This movement may explain the increase number of students in the less than 40% time in regular environments.

**Progress on Indicator 5.C:** On Indicator 5.C., the State improved in performance from 1.7% last year to 1.3% this year. The, rigorous target of 1.5% was met.

Monitoring observations confirm that a wide variety of educational settings and services continue to be made available to meet students' individual needs, as required by IDEA.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2010:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
2011	Collaborate with IT regarding implementation of the new ISEE longitudinal data system that will collect Child Count, including LRE information, to ensure accuracy of LRE data.	Ongoing	Issues continue impacting timely analysis of Child Count Data. The special education department continues to work with ISEE and districts with the data collection process and tracking data uploads, assuring standardized data cleaning, and assuring retrievability of data.
2011	Contact districts with significant year-to-year changes in LRE categories to determine reasons behind the progress or slippage.	Ongoing	Verification of data takes place within 40 calendar days of district uploads. Initial data uploads are improving.
2011	Provide annual training of district personnel about Child Count definitions and procedures to ensure that educational environment data are reported accurately.	September 2012	Published a data collection handbook. Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator conducted five webinars and made on site visits to 34 districts.
2011	Establish standardized data analysis processes in the cleaning and retrievability of Child Count Data	June 2012 – December 2012	Completed desk manual with details of data collection, analysis, and reporting requirements.
2011	Review historical data to establish trends in placement by disability and district. Present findings at stakeholder meetings (e.g. special education directors, district superintendents, parent advisory groups) for feedback.	On going	Refinement of data sets has been completed. Presentations to advisory committees began in November 2012 and will continue through 2013 calendar year.
2011	Provide technical assistance to districts with the lowest LRE data	January 2012 – May 2012	Regional Coordinators logged 357 contacts with districts specific to LRE issues.
2011	Provide and disseminate resources on effective instructional strategies that increase performance in the general education classroom	Ongoing	The SDE conducted trainings and posted resources on its website in the areas of reading, math, response to intervention and positive behavior supports.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Provide technical assistance to districts with the lowest LRE data	January 2013 – May 2013	SDE Coordinator Regional Consultants	Practices leading to progress can be used as positive examples for low performing districts.
2012	Provide annual training of district personnel about Child Count definitions and procedures to ensure that educational environment data are reported accurately.	Fall 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Funding And Accountability Coordinator Part-B funds	Training is required to assure completeness and accuracy of uploaded data. With a rebuilding of the collection system, all districts will require training.
2012	Provide and disseminate resources on effective instructional strategies that increase performance in the general education classroom	Ongoing	SDE Coordinators (RTI Coordinator collaborating with others)	Continuous training on effective reading, math, RTI and PBIS are requested by districts.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

The collection of data regarding early childhood educational environments and location of special education services was developed during with the input of Special Education Directors, Early Childhood Preschool teachers, and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council in a series of statewide meeting conducted by the SDE's Early Childhood and Interagency Coordinator.

### Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 6:** Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

### Measurement:

- A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .

### Baseline Data for FFY 2011 (2010-2011):

- A. Attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.
- B. Attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

A. Attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.	B. Attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
<b>30.4%</b>	<b>50.3%</b>

### Discussion of Baseline Data:

The state of Idaho does not fund preschool programs for non-disabled students resulting in a significant number of services for students with disabilities being delivered in strictly special education placements (50.3%). The initial goal for improvement is to increase placement in regular early childhood programs



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

(e.g., Head Start) 1% annually and decrease placements in strictly special education environments by 0.5%. Goals and improvement activities were established by stakeholders including representatives from the State Department of Education, Idaho Head Start Association, Head Start Collaboration Office, Public Health, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and parents.

Idaho ensures that all LRE considerations apply to preschool students with disabilities who are entitled to receive special education and related services. Settings for implementing IEPs for students of preschool and kindergarten age are the same as for all other school-age children. LEAs are not required to initiate such programs solely to satisfy LRE requirements. However, the LEA must meet the individual needs of preschool children with disabilities in least restrictive environments by providing alternative settings, which may include:

- Providing opportunities for participation (including part-time) of preschool children with disabilities in other preschool settings operated for preschool children without disabilities by other agencies (Head Start, NAEYC accredited preschools, licensed child care).
- Placing preschool children with disabilities in the following:
  - Private school programs for preschool children without disabilities; or
  - Private preschool programs that integrate children with and without disabilities; and
  - Locating classes for preschool children with disabilities in elementary schools and integrating those children in typical kindergarten, recess music, art, library, reading time, and other activities as individually appropriate.

### Targets and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

<b>Educational Placement Data for FFY 2011</b>	<b>Education Environment</b>	<b>Special Education Setting Count<sup>1</sup> (a)</b>	<b>Special Education Child Count, ages 3-5<sup>2</sup> (b)</b>	<b>Educational Placement Percent <math>\%=(a/b)*100</math></b>
6A	Attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1026	3379	<b>30.4%</b>
6B	Attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1701	3379	<b>50.3%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Special Education Setting Count is reported annually with the Special Education Child Count data collection and includes students with disabilities, ages 3-5.

<sup>2</sup>Special Education Child Count is the annual Special Education Child Count data collection and includes students with disabilities, ages 3-5.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target for 6A</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>
2010	Not required this year.	Not required this year.
2011	30.4%	30.4%
2012	31.4%	

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target for 6B</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>
2010	Not required this year.	Not required this year.
2011	50.3%	50.3%
2012	49.8%	

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2010:**

Not required for FFY 2010.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>2012 (2012– 2013)</b>	Collaborate with Head Start to provide additional LRE options	January 2013 – December 2013	Early Childhood Coordinator Part B Funds	Students with and without disabilities benefit from more inclusive environments with increased social skills seen in all children.
<b>2012</b>	Provide training on reporting EC LRE data	On Going	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Early Childhood Coordinator Part B Funds	Accurate and timely data will contribute to appropriate decision making by stakeholders.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>2012</b>	Share promising practices via the SDE SpEd Newsletter	Discontinued	Discontinued	SDE SpEd Newsletter discontinued in 2009-2010
<b>2012</b>	Collect data regarding barriers to placement in regular early childhood programs	April 2013 – November 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Early Childhood Coordinator Part B Funds	Accurate and timely data will contribute to appropriate decision making by stakeholders.
<b>2012</b>	Work with stakeholders to identify solutions to barriers to placement in regular early childhood programs	October 2013 – November 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Early Childhood Coordinator Part B Funds	All stakeholders have insights into the problem issues facing inclusionary practices and can offer “doable” solutions.
<b>2012</b>	Provide data to the Idaho State School Board	October 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Early Childhood Coordinator Part B Funds	Providing findings to policy makers may increase the stakeholder pool and lead to guidelines, policies, and legislation to increase preschool options for all children.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 7:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

**Outcomes:**

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

**Progress categories for A, B, and C:**

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning, comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (used for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c)) plus( # of preschool children reported in category (d))] divided by [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (a)) plus( # of preschool children reported in progress category (b)) plus (# of preschool children reported in progress category (c)) plus(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d)) plus (# of preschool children reported in progress category (e))] divided by the total [# of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) plus (b) plus (c) plus (d) plus (e)] times 100.

**Corrections:** In reviewing data sets for the FFY 2011 submission, it was discovered calculations used for reporting in FFY 2008, FFY 2009, and FFY 2010 used multiple year cumulative counts. For the FFY 2010, calculations were completed during a period when the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator's position was vacant and no review was made of the raw data prior to submission for the Annual Progress Report. Upon recalculation of the data from these years, using the correct calculations, it was determined that the State still met the targets set for those years so that there was no need to set new targets. To assure accurate data collection and use, improvement activities were added to the SPP.

Corrected calculations for FFY 2008, 2009, and 2010 are listed below.

### Corrected Baseline Data for FFY 2008:

Summary Statements	Targets FFY 2008 (% of children)
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>84%</b>
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	<b>57%</b>
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>86%</b>
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	<b>50%</b>
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially	<b>76%</b>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	<b>67%</b>

**Corrected Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY 2008:**

<b>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	5	0.6%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	50	6.2%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	289	35.9%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	387	48.0%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	75	9.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	8	1.0%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	54	6.7%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	337	41.8%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	359	44.5%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	48	6.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	8	1.0%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	57	7.1%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	204	25.3%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	412	51.1%

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	125	15.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Corrected Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:**

Summary Statements	Original SPP Targets FFY 2009 (% of children)	Actual FFY 2009 (% of children)
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>93.0%</b>	92.9% Target Not Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	<b>56.5%</b>	56.9% Target Met
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>92.7%</b>	91.1% Target Not Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	<b>51.0%</b>	54.4% Target Met
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>90.7%</b>	92.1% Target Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	<b>66.2%</b>	70.1% Target Met

**Corrected Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY 2009:**

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	5	0.5%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	54	5.8%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	341	36.8%

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	430	46.4%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	97	10.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	8	0.9%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	69	7.4%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	346	37.3%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	440	47.5%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	64	6.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	4	0.4%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	5.9%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	218	23.5%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	466	50.3%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	184	19.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Corrected Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

Summary Statements	Original SPP Targets FFY 2010 (% of children)	Actual FFY 2010 (% of children)
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>93.5%</b>	93.2% Target Not Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	<b>57.0%</b>	60.1% Target Met
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>93.2%</b>	93.1% Target Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	<b>51.5%</b>	54.7% Target Met
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>91.2%</b>	92.9% Target Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	<b>67.0%</b>	70.4% Target Met

### Corrected Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY 2010:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	2	0.2%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	58	5.9%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	330	33.8%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	487	49.8%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	100	10.2%

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

Total	<b>977</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	3	0.3%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	60	6.1%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	380	38.9%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	468	47.9%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	66	6.8%
Total	<b>977</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	3	0.3%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	5.6%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	231	23.6%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	532	54.5%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	156	16.0%
Total	<b>977</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Summary Statements	Targets FFY 2011 (% of children)	Actual FFY 2011 (% of children)
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>93.5%</b>	90.8% Target Not Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	<b>57%</b>	58.0% Target Met
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>93.2%</b>	90.9% Target Not Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	<b>52.3%</b>	53.4% Target Met
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	<b>91.2%</b>	91.1% Target Not Met
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	<b>67.8%</b>	69.4% Target Met

### Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY 2011:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	8	0.8%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	68	7.1%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	326	34.0%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	422	44.1%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	134	14.0%

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

Total	<b>958</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	9	0.9%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	70	7.3%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	367	38.3%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	423	44.2%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	89	9.3%
Total	<b>958</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	9	0.9%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	58	6.1%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	226	23.6%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	456	47.6%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	209	21.8%
Total	<b>958</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

Slippage was seen in three of six outcome measures due, in part, to data corrections and recalculations. In past years, Calculations were based on multiple year cumulative counts rather than FFY counts.

Targets for A1, B1, and C1 were missed. For Outcome C1, the target was missed by only 0.1%. Although the data do not show progress, the SDE believes that the data are becoming more complete as educators are increasing their use of the assessment tools at increasingly more regular intervals. More promising are the increases in children who entered at same-age peer levels, increased skills to that of age expectations, or maintained age expectation levels as indicated in A2, B2, and C2, indicators which met targets.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Progress or Slippage</b>	<b>Corrected FFY 2010</b>	<b>FFY 2011</b>	<b>Change (FFY 2010 to FFY 2011)</b>	<b>Met Original SPP Goal?</b>
A1: Social-emotional skills	93.2%	91.4%	1.8% Slippage	No
A2: Age appropriate	60.1%	58.4%	1.7% Slippage	Yes
B1: Communication & literacy skills	93.1%	90.9%	2.2% Slippage	No
B2: Age appropriate	54.7%	53.4%	1.3% Slippage	Yes
C1: Behavior skills	92.9%	91.1%	1.8% Slippage	No
C2: Age appropriate	70.4%	69.4%	1.0% Slippage	Yes

All Districts with students enrolled in preschool programs for at least six months prior to exiting, were required to report ECO data. The number of students reported for FFY 2011 (958) decreased by 19 students from the corrected data set for FFY 2010 (977).

**Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers”**

Idaho uses the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF-R). “Comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COSF-R. Data used to determine the COSF-R rating is gathered from an anchor assessment along with a parent interview and child observation. The anchor assessment must be selected from the following list:

- Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS)
- Battelle Developmental Inventory-II
- Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development, Third Edition (Bayley-III)
- Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development-Revised
- Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs (CCITSN)
- Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum Assessment ToolKit (Creative Curriculum for Preschool, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)
- Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
- High Scope (COR) Infant and Toddler
- High Scope (COR)Preschool Crosswalk

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

- Ounce
- Working Sampling System (WSS)

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	SDE reviews ECO forms required from a percentage of EC teachers and provides feedback.	March 2012	ECO forms and process were evaluated. EC teachers provided input on incorporating the ECO process into the IEP process.
2011	Original activity: Infant Toddler program and the SDE collaborate to align Part C exit data with Part B entry data.  Revised activity: Part B will utilize Part C data as a source in development of the student IEP which will include ECO ratings.	May 2012	New IEP form development has begun with ECO data imbedded for both data collection and compliance monitoring.
2011	Compare students reported to SDE on December 1 Count with student entered into ECO data base to assure comprehensive reporting of students served in EC programs longer than 6 months	May 2012/Annual activity	Comparison triggered audit of previous data and recalculation of ECO data from FFY 2008 through FFY 2011.
2011	Develop on-line training module to educate EC teachers on policies, procedures, and required documentation for reporting on ECO's.	May 2012	Training modules have been added to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse: <a href="http://idahotc.com/earlychildhood/Home.aspx">http://idahotc.com/earlychildhood/Home.aspx</a>

### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

New Improvement Activities Added to SPP for Indicator # 7				
FFY	Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources	Justification
2012	Align the eGuidelines to the ECOs	Feb. 2013	EC Coordinator Part B funds	The Idaho Early Learning eGuidelines are a resource designed to assist in guiding children's development and learning.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>2012</b>	Review and revise the Preschool Compliance Review	Sept. 2013	EC Coordinator Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Part B funds	To improve quality assurance and that all students are represented in the ECO data.
<b>2012</b>	SDE reviews ECO forms required from a percentage of EC teachers and provides feedback	March 2013	EC Coordinator SDE staff Regional Coordinators Part B funds	Implementing a quality assurance activity to assure that ECO rating is reflective of the student. Developing a statewide process to embed ECO scores into IEP.
<b>2012</b>	Review data collections and calculations to assure accurate reporting.	July 2013 to December 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Part B funds	To improve quality assurance and that all students are represented in the ECO data.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 8:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

$$36\% = (126/349) * 100$$

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The SDE contracted with Piedra Data Services to develop and distribute the Parent Participation Survey. Analysis of the data was completed by Dr. Penfield. The survey consisted of a 25-item rating scale, the Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). One survey is used for all respondents from preschool through grade 12. The 25 questions were displayed in English on the front and in Spanish on the back of the page. Demographic items addressing the student's race/ethnicity, grade, and primary exceptionality were also included. A total of 2,581 surveys were distributed to a representative sample of parents of students with disabilities in 14 school districts in Year 5 of the OSEP approved sampling plan outlined in the SPP. Of these, 349 (13.52%) were returned. The SDE noted a significant drop in returned surveys by parents of preschool age students. The number of returned surveys exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines (e.g., <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>). The data set submitted for analysis contained no personally identifiable information on the respondents.

Data from the rating scale were analyzed through the Rasch measurement framework. The analysis produces a measure on a scale from zero to 1,000 for each survey respondent. Each measure reflects the extent to which the parent indicated that schools facilitated that parent's involvement. The measures of all respondents were averaged to yield a mean measure reflecting the overall performance of the State of Idaho in regard to schools' facilitation of parent involvement.

OSEP requires that states' performance be reported as the *percent* of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement. Deriving a percent from a continuous distribution requires application of a standard, or cut-score. The Idaho SDE elected to apply the standard recommended by a nationally representative stakeholder group convened by NCSEAM. The recommended standard, established based on item content expressed in the scale, was operationalized as a measure of 600. Thus, the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement was calculated as the percent of parents with a measure of 600 or above on the SEPPS.

Below are the survey questions in the order they would be ranked if the parent agreed or strongly agreed with each statement. As you can see, a score of 600 is a very high standard. A parent would have to agree



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

with almost every statement in order to hit the “Gold Standard” of 600. 36% of parents who responded did score their district at or above the Gold Standard.

Score	Parent Survey Questions (SEPPS)
672	I was given information about options my child will have after high school.
653	The school offers parents training about special education issues.
647	I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.
634	The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.
<b>600 Gold Standard</b>	The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.
591	I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.
581	The school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.
573	Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services in the regular classroom.
570	The school gives me choices with regard to services that address my child's needs.
564	At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments.
561	The school offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers.
550	The school communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.
544	Teachers and administrators seek out parent input.
533	Teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.
528	Teachers and administrators ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards [the rules in federal law that protect the rights of parents].
526	Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.
523	The school has a person on staff that is available to answer parents' questions.
513	All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.
511	Teachers treat me as a team member.
507	I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program.
505	My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand.
505	Written information I receive is written in an understandable way.
504	Teachers and administrators respect my cultural heritage.
492	Teachers are available to speak with me.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

490	At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need.
-----	---

### Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011	32%	36%

Parent Survey Statistics for 2011-2012	
Number of surveys mailed to parents with children with disabilities attending districts in the Year-4 sample (refer to sampling plan in SPP).	2,581
Completed Surveys Returned	349
<b>Return rate</b>	<b>13.52%</b>
Number of respondent parents surveyed who scored schools at or above the gold standard of 600 when rating schools' facilitation of parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	126
Percent of respondent parents surveyed who scored schools higher than the gold standard of 600 when rating schools' facilitation of parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	36%

### Four-Year Comparison

FFY	Target	Actual Target Performance
2006	Baseline 27%	26%
2007	28%	25%
2008	29%	35%
2009	30%	33%
2010	31%	34%
2011	32%	36%

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The following table shows that, of parents who responded to the survey, Mixed race, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and White parents rated their opportunity for involvement the highest. However, of the 33 Hispanic, Asian, Black, or Hawaiian parents who responded, only six rated their involvement at the Gold Standard.

Percent of Parents at or above the Gold Standard Score by Racial/Ethnic Category			
Race/Ethnicity	Total #	# Meeting Gold Standard	% Meeting Gold Standard
2 or More Races	9	3	50%*
Hispanic or Latino	42	18	43%*
American Indian/Alaskan Native	-	-	-
White	278	96	35%
Asian	8	4	50%*
Black/African American	10	2	20%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2	1	50%*

(\*Green indicates a score at or above the statewide average of 36%.)

The following table indicates that parents of elementary children feel more involved while parents of secondary students feel least involved.

Percent of Parents at or above the Gold Standard Score by Grade Category			
Grade	Total #	# Meeting Gold Standard	% Meeting Gold Standard
Pre-Kindergarten	0	0	0%
Kindergarten – Grade 5	140	49	35%
Grades 6 - 8	75	29	39%*
Grades 9 - 12	80	26	33%
Missing	54	20	37%*

(\*Green indicates a score at or above the statewide average of 36%)

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The following table shows that parents of students with Autism feel the most involved, followed by parents of students with speech or language impairment or emotional disturbance. Parents of students with low incidence disabilities also met the state average for involvement. Parents of students with a learning disability or cognitive impairment rated their opportunity for involvement the lowest.

Percent of Parents at or above the Gold Standard Score by Exceptionality			
Student's Primary Exceptionality	Total #	# Meeting Gold Standard	% Meeting Gold Standard
Learning Disability	72	30	42%*
Cognitive Impairment	40	9	23%
Emotional Disturbance	18	8	44%*
Speech or Language Impairment	73	21	29%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	49	16	33%
All other disabilities	97	40	41%*

(\*Green indicates a score at or above the statewide average of 36%)

### Representativeness of Respondents:

An analysis of survey data focusing on disability and race/ethnicity between respondents and the target population indicates that the respondents are representative of the target population in all areas except for under-representation of learning disabilities (5.3%) and minority groups (5.4%) and over-representation of cognitive disability (4.4%). All the other demographic categories are within the statistically expected range (plus or minus 2.6%) as shown in the table below. The "Year-5" districts surveyed were a representative slice of Idaho with surveys returned from every district in the sample group.

Representativeness	Overall	LD	ED	CI	All Other Disabilities	Minority	Disability Missing	Race Missing
Surveys sent	2581	669	134	183	1595	430		
Response Totals	349	72	18	40	219	71	0	0
Target Survey Representation		25.9%	5.2%	7.1%	61.8%	21.9%		
Respondent Representation		20.6%	5.2%	11.5%	62.8%	16.5%		
Difference		-5.3%	0%	4.4%	1.0%	-5.4%		

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Distribution of Respondents by Grade		
Grade	Number	Percentage
Pre-Kindergarten	4	1%
Kindergarten – Grade 5	140	40%
Grades 6 – 8	75	21%
Grades 9 – 12	80	23%
Grade missing	54	15%

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

#### Progress:

36% of the parents who returned the survey scored school facilitation of parent participation at or above the gold standard of 600. This represents a 2% increase over the previous year and well above the baseline of 26%. Idaho met and exceeded the target of 32% for FFY 2011. Idaho's mean measure on the SEPPS is 558. A mean measure of 558 indicates that schools are facilitating parent involvement in many ways. For example, approximately 86%-92% of parents of students receiving special education services in Idaho agreed (with over 53% agreeing strongly or very strongly) with statements to the effect that teachers are available to speak with parents, parents are considered equal partners with teachers and other professionals in planning their child's program, and all of the parent's concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.

In other respects, schools' facilitation of parent involvement is less consistent. Parents expressed weaker agreement – with approximately 66%-84% agreeing overall, and 30%-52% expressing strong or very strong agreement - with statements to the effect that teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities, teachers and administrators seek out parent input, and schools explain what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school. In still other areas, schools have even greater room for improvement. Only 45%-49% of parents of students with disabilities in Idaho agreed (and only 21%-25% agreed strongly or very strongly) with statements to the effect that parents were given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities, schools offer parents training about special education issues, and parents were given information about options their child will have after high school.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
2011	Work with community stakeholders and service agencies, districts and other SDE staff in Coordinated School Health to redraft the Idaho Rule on Restraint and Seclusion. This work will be reviewed by Idaho's Special Education Advisory Panel and other community stakeholders.	Ongoing	Using the USDofE document <i>Restraint and Seclusion: Resource Document</i> , the SDE has begun dialog among SDE directors to review and amend the Idaho Rule on Restraint and Seclusion. Meetings with other stakeholders have been scheduled.
2011	Train district staff on how log in and set up the online Parent Survey for parents to complete after their annual IEP meeting.	Sept. 2012	Training completed and data uploads were timely and accurate.
2011	Update and expand parent resources on SDE website	Nov. 2012	Websites are continually being updated across subject areas. Additional work in being done with the IT department to make data easier to view on public reporting links.
2011	Work with the Special Education Statewide Technical Assistance staff (SESTA) and PBIS Project Coordinator to increase awareness of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) project. This will occur through regional trainings and workshops informing districts and schools as to the necessary preparations for implementation, fidelity and sustainability.	Sept. 2011 – May 2012	SESTA and PBIS continue to provide trainings across the state. The SDE is committed to the PBIS projects and has seen movement towards fewer behavioral referrals and behavioral actions (suspensions and expulsions) across all districts in the state.
2011	Create and distribute information about Dispute Resolution services for parents and districts targeting preventative activities, specifically facilitation of IEP meetings and collaboration between families and schools. Utilize parent organizations and service providers as a vehicle to distribute information along with districts and schools.	March 2012	Information has been disseminated and the Dispute Resolution Office is receiving a greater number of requests for IEP facilitations.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2011	Launch census parent survey in every district. Parents complete an online survey at the end of the annual IEP meeting.	Not Begun	Resources and personnel restrictions have prevented this project from being realized.
2011	Work with community stakeholders and service agencies, districts and other SDE staff to develop methods to increase survey response rates that is cost neutral. This work will be reviewed by Idaho's Special Education Advisory Panel and other community stakeholders.	March 2012 – December 2012	The SDE is looking at a number of activities, including the use of a new vendor, to carry out the surveys required for this indicator.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 [If applicable]:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
Carry over from 2011	Continue work with community stakeholders and service agencies, districts and other SDE staff in Coordinated School Health to redraft the Idaho Rule on Restraint and Seclusion. This work will be reviewed by Idaho's Special Education Advisory Panel and other community stakeholders.	Ongoing	SDE Parent/Community Involvement Coordinator Community Stakeholders SDE Coordinated School Health Staff Part B Funds	Need to review current practices and procedures to better support children with disabilities with behavioral needs and establish proactive positive interventions
2012	Provide technical assistance to districts regarding restraint and seclusion policies. Encourage all districts to draft formal policies and procedures regarding restraint and seclusion of students. (This will be secondary to the goal for 2012, assuming the state will approve the redrafted rule).	Fall 2013	SDE Parent/Community Involvement Coordinator SDE Special Education Director Regional Coordinators	There continues to be a need for districts to have resources regarding restraint and seclusion in addition to access to training.
2012	Develop training for districts, schools and parents related to conflict resolution and communication. This will be an effort to increase positive communication and conflict resolution skills among special education staff and	Spring 2012 – Fall 2013	SDE Dispute Resolution Coordinator Parent/Community Involvement Coordinator	The goal is to equip all stakeholders with the skills needed to communicate effectively with the single goal to improve the

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	parents who have children with a disability.		Contractors / Mediators who already work with the SDE in IEP facilitation and mediation services	education of children with disabilities.
--	--	--	--	--



**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation**

**Indicator 9:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

**Data Source:**

Data collected under IDEA section 618 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended) and the State's analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Idaho's E-Formula used to flag disproportionate districts:**

$$E = A + \text{Sqrt} [A * (100-A)/N]$$

*Where:*

E = Maximum percentage of the total special education enrollment in a district allowed for a specific ethnic minority group.

A = Percentage of the same ethnic minority group in the District enrollment.

N = Total special education enrollment in the District.

**Definition of Disproportionate Representation:**

Over-representation is calculated on seven ethnic/racial categories for all districts. Over-representation is defined as greater than five (5) over the statistically expected range as determined by using the E-Formula. The E-Formula takes into account the "N" size when calculating the statistically expected range so that no district is exempt from analysis for every racial and ethnic group enrolled in the District.

**Determination of Inappropriate Identification:**

By applying the E-Formula to district data, SDE identifies districts with numbers that fall outside statistical expectations, as described above, as having disproportionate representation. Each of those districts must complete a Performance Response that includes an explanation of policies, practices, and procedures used to refer, evaluate, and identify students for special education. The SDE also selects student eligibility files to review. District responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by the SDE to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected, based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the SDE looks for a preponderance of evidence based on functional data collected to support eligibility for special education. The SDE also checks to see if the exclusionary factors have been adequately addressed. From this information, the SDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

identification, and if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance in regard to the appropriateness of the District's identification policies, practices, and procedures.

The number of districts analyzed was 150. No districts were found to have over-representation for FFY 2011 (using data from SY 2010-2011). More accurate reporting of race/ethnicity on district child counts and the ability to cross-reference and verify race/ethnicity with core data in the ISEE system accounts for the decrease in districts flagged as disproportionate.

FFY	Target	Actual Data for FFY 2011
2011	0%	0% (0/150)

### Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Year	Total Number of Districts	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2011 (2010-2011)	150	0	0	0%

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

The SDE examined data from 150 districts for all races and ethnicities in the district. Currently, the SDE uses the e-formula to determine the over-representation of each ethnic group compared to the distribution of those ethnic groups in the general education population. The percent of a particular ethnic group is compared to the maximum percentage value calculated using the e-formula. A district fails the e-formula test if the percent of an ethnicity in special education either exceeds the maximum value (five students) for that ethnicity. If the district exceeds the benchmark using the disparity test and the district is determined to have disproportionate representation using the e-formula (either over-represented), the district is identified as having disproportionate representation and further monitoring is conducted to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of improper policies, practices, or procedures.

The E-Formula produces an acceptable error range that is larger when numbers are small, so no exclusions or minimum "N" size is necessary. Data has been analyzed for over-representation.

**Progress:** For the third year in a row, no districts were found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups that was the result of inappropriate identification. As policies, practices, and procedures have improved, the overall state data is showing that every race or ethnic group is coming closer to matching statistical expectations. The implementation of the new SLD criteria has provided structure that assists with sorting out difference from a disability and is resulting in students receiving the help they need without rushing to a special education referral process.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

An analysis of the FFY 2011 data confirms efforts to correct FFY 2010 coding errors for race/ethnicity in the upload process succeeded and districts were able to accurately upload correct codes for students and the SDE was able to verify the accuracy of data reports through cross-referencing.

### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator is 0%.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	0
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Train the trainers to use the ELL/SpEd Toolkit and contract with trainers to train at least two times this year, with a focus on districts with over-representation of CLD students.	Fall 2011-Spring 2012	Training was coordinated and delivered through the Statewide System Support division.
2011	New SLD/CLD training in all regions of the State.	Fall 2011-Spring 2012	Training was coordinated and delivered through the Statewide System Support division.
2011	Continue support for the RTI Initiative to build capacity of districts to screen students and provide early-tiered interventions for those at risk.	Fall 2011-Spring 2012	The Statewide System of Support offers ongoing training and support to districts and schools. This office maintains an information and resource website ( <a href="http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/rti/">http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/rti/</a> ) that is updated on a regular basis.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2011	Correct data upload errors specific to coding race and ethnicity	January 2012 - December 2012	Districts with data entry problems were provided with technical assistance. Coding and programming corrections were made in the ISEE system Cross validations were conducted to assure accuracy of data uploads
2011	Districts with performance below state trigger will be required to complete a performance response worksheet for data drill down and effective improvement strategies.	January 2012 - December 2012	Districts with data entry problems were provided with technical assistance. Coding and programming corrections were made in the ISEE system Cross validations were conducted to assure accuracy of data uploads
2011	Provide training to districts in data upload procedures on the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), a K-12 Longitudinal Data System and coding of race/ethnicity based on The Idaho State Department of Education <i>Guide to Implementing New Federal Race and Ethnicity</i> ( <a href="http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/docs/Idaho%20Guide%20Race%20Ethnicity.pdf">http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/docs/Idaho%20Guide%20Race%20Ethnicity.pdf</a> ).	March 2012 – December 2012	Coordinated training and technical assistance was provided to districts by the IT/ISEE staff, the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator, and the Funding and Accountability Coordinator.  A Technical Assistance Document was written and provided to districts.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

FFY	Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources	Justification
2012	Train the Trainers to use the ELL/SpEd Toolkit and contract with trainers to train at least 2 times this year, with a focus on districts with over-representation of CLD students.	Fall 2012- Spring 2013	Part B Funds Title 2 Funds Contracted Trainers	Idaho demographics are changing with a larger representation of those who identify themselves as Hispanic and families with Spanish as the home language. Districts that have been historically “white” and/or English speaking are now seeing demographic changes. Trainings are needed to address continued needs but, also, emerging needs resulting from demographic changes across the state.
2012	New SLD/CLD training in all regions of the state	Fall 2012- Spring 2013	Part B Funds	Idaho demographics are changing with a larger

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				representation of those who identify themselves as Hispanic and families with Spanish as the home language. Districts that have been historically “white” and/or English speaking are now seeing demographic changes. Trainings are needed to address continued needs but, also, emerging needs resulting from demographic changes across the state.
2012	Continue support for the RTI Initiative to build capacity of districts to screen students and provide early tiered interventions for those at risk	Fall 2012-Spring 2013	Part B Funds	RTI has an increasing research base as a successful process for early intervention and identification of students needing special education services and those needing other types of supports and services.

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation**

**Indicator 10:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

**Data Source:**

Data collected under IDEA section 618 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended) and the State's analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**E-Formula applied to Indicator 10:**

$$E = A + \text{Sqrt} [A * (100-A)/N]$$

*Where:*

E = Maximum percentage of a specific disability category in a district allowed for a specific ethnic minority group.

A = Percentage of the same ethnic minority group in regular education in the district.

N = Total number of special education students in the district identified with that specific disability.

**Definition of Disproportionate Representation:**

Over- representation is calculated for all districts. Over-representation is defined as greater than five over the statistically expected range as determined by using the E-Formula. The E-Formula takes into account the "N" size when calculating the statistically expected range so that no district is exempt from analysis for every racial and ethnic group enrolled in the district for every disability category.

**Determination of Inappropriate Identification:**

By applying the E-Formula to district data, SDE identifies districts with numbers that fall outside statistical expectations, as described above, as having disproportionate representation. Each of those districts must complete a Performance Response that includes an explanation of policies, practices, and procedures used to refer, evaluate, and identify students for special education. The SDE also selects student eligibility files to review. District responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by the SDE to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected, based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the SDE looks for a preponderance of evidence based on functional data collected to support eligibility for the special

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

education disability category. The SDE also checks to see if the exclusionary factors have been adequately addressed. From this information, the SDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification and if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance in regard to the appropriateness of the District's identification policies, practices, and procedures.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data
2011	0%	0%

### Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Year	Total Number of Districts	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in specific disability categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2011 (2011-2012)	150	5	0	0.00%

The SDE examined data for every disability in every district (150) for all races and ethnicities for over-representation. Five (5) districts were found to have over-representation as described in the definition. Of these, no district had disproportionate overrepresentation identified in a racial and ethnic group in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a).

More accurate reporting of race/ethnicity on district child counts and the ability to cross-reference and verify race/ethnicity with core data in the ISEE system accounts for the decrease in districts flagged as disproportionate.

Districts with Representation that is Over Statistical Expectations (Highlight indicates inappropriate identification)								
DISTRICT	DISABILITY	NATIVE AMERICAN	ASIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	TWO OR MORE	WHITE	PACIFIC ISLANDER
A	Learning Disability				OVER			
A	Language Impairment	OVER						
B	Learning Disability				OVER			
C	Learning Disability				OVER			
D	Language				OVER			

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Districts with Representation that is Over Statistical Expectations</b> (Highlight indicates inappropriate identification)								
DISTRICT	DISABILITY	NATIVE AMERICAN	ASIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	TWO OR MORE	WHITE	PACIFIC ISLANDER
	Impairment							
E	Learning Disability				OVER			
E	Language Impairment				OVER			
E	Developmental Disability				OVER			

**Progress for FFY 2011:**

Progress: No districts were found to have over-representation, due to inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures or as a result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The State improved from 2.26% in FFY 2008 to 0% in FFY 2009, 0% in 2010 and, currently 0% in 2011.

An analysis of the FFY 2011 data confirms efforts to correct FFY 2010 coding errors for race/ethnicity in the upload process succeeded and districts were able to accurately upload correct codes for students and the SDE was able to verify the accuracy of data reports through cross-referencing.

**Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported more than 0% compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 0.0%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	<b>0</b>
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	<b>0</b>
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>0</b>
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	<b>0</b>
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

**Improvement Activities Completed:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
2011	Implement statewide training based on need or request using the ELL/SpEd Toolkit	February 2012	Training was coordinated and delivered through the Statewide System Support division.
2011	Expand the pool of SLD Peer Reviewers	September 2012	The pool of reviewers was doubled in SY 2011-2012 from 18 to 36.
2011	Continue SLD training statewide	September 2011 through May 2012	In addition to the April SLD peer review training, training in each region of the state was completed.
2011	Continue to support the SLD Learning Community site	September 2011	The site is continually updated and now has exemplars of SLD assessments/eligibilities posted.
2011	Correct data upload errors specific to coding race and ethnicity	January 2012 – June 2012	Districts with data entry problems were provided with technical assistance. Coding and programming corrections were made in the ISEE system Cross validations were conducted to assure accuracy of data uploads
2011	Conduct a focused review of files during the annual CCV monitoring to document race/ethnicity for verification with CC submissions	March 2012	Additional files were pulled for review. Reviews were conducted by two teams with results compared and verified by the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator. No findings of disproportionate representation were found.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2011	Provide training to districts in data upload procedures on the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), a K-12 Longitudinal Data System and coding of race/ethnicity based on The Idaho State Department of Education <i>Guide to Implementing New Federal Race and Ethnicity</i>	March 2012 – June 2012	Districts with data entry problems were provided with technical assistance. Coding and programming corrections were made in the ISEE system Cross validations were conducted to assure accuracy of data uploads
------	--	---------------------------	---

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Continue statewide training based on need or request using the ELL/SpEd Toolkit	February 2013	Part B Funds	Data demonstrates a need for additional training in regard to appropriately serving students with cultural or linguistic differences.
2012	Expand the pool of SLD Peer Reviewers	September 2012	Part B Funds	Data demonstrates a need for additional training in regard to appropriately serving students with cultural or linguistic differences.
2012	Continue SLD training statewide	September 2012 through May 2013	Part B Funds	Data demonstrates a need for additional training in regard to appropriately serving students with cultural or linguistic differences.
2012	Continue to support the SLD Learning Community site	September 2012	Part B Funds	Data demonstrates a need for additional training in regard to appropriately serving students with cultural or linguistic differences.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Indicator 11:** Percent of children evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Measurement:

- a. Percent of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. Percent of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days.

Account for children included in a. but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Performance
2009	100%	98%
2010	100%	95%
2011	100%	95%

#### Method used to collect data:

The state conducts an online census data collection. The data collection was developed with stakeholder input and training was conducted prior to the collection date. Technical assistance was available one-on-one during the reporting window. Data covers July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011.

#### Children Evaluated Within 60 Days:

a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	4299
b. Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or state-established timeline)	4099
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days  (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	95%

The range of days late varied from one day late for five eligibility determinations, due to scheduling issues an in-district transfer, and itinerant staff availability, to one that was 129 days late due to a family medical emergency. Of those that exceeded the 60-day timeline, 81% were completed within one month and 96% were completed within two months.

*Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline and provide reasons for the delays*

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Number Late	Reason for Delay	Range of Days Late
74	Scheduling difficulties	1-62
22	Additional assessment needed	1-90
8	Staffing issues	2-24
9	Extended medical issues	9-85
87	Other	1-120
<b>200</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 - 120</b>

### Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

**Maintained:** The state maintained a performance of 95% completion rate of initial eligibilities within the 60-day timeline for the last two years. This is above the baseline of 91%, however Idaho did miss the target of 100%. The number of districts with findings on this indicator decreased from 40 in FFY 2010 to 33 in FFY 2011. Twenty of these districts had only one or two eligibilities late. Four districts had 68 of the late referrals.

Improvement in data coding by districts and clarification by the SDE reduced the number of initial null cells for reason for lateness. Follow up during the clarification period documented reasons for late evaluations and technical assistance was provided to those districts.

### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator was 95%.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	<b>40</b>
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	<b>40</b>
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

### Describe the specific actions that the state took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

In FFY 2010, for Indicator 11, there were 40 findings of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures and no dispute resolution findings of noncompliance.

All instances of noncompliance, found through the state's on-site monitoring system, other monitoring procedures, review of data collected by the state, including compliance data collected through the state data system, and by the (SDE) Department, are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool except for noncompliance found through the dispute resolution process. A separate database is used for tracking the correction and verification of dispute resolution findings. It is important to note, that all instances of noncompliance are found and verified as corrected at the individual student level and at the district level. This is done by verifying that each LEA with a non-compliance identified in FFY 2010 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

These findings are verified as corrected at the individual student level. All Indicator 11 data is entered at a student level. Notice, in writing, is then sent to each LEA that includes the citation of the statute or regulation, a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data (including percentage levels of compliance) supporting the state's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation, and the requirement that noncompliance is to be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification, which is the date of written notification. The LEA and SDE collaborate to determine the root cause and design a plan for correction that may include, if needed, change to policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to, or resulted in noncompliance.

Following the implementation of the plan for correction, SDE staff conducts an on-site follow-up review to verify correction of the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. SDE staff verifies correction of the individual instances of noncompliance for each LEA onsite. Verification of correction of noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement that is subject to a specific timeline includes verifying through file reviews that the LEA has provided the required action (i.e. evaluation, IEP and/or service), although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition, SDE staff reviewed subsequent data to verify that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements including a check to see if the most recent time specific 60-day timelines are compliant. After verification has occurred, the SDE staff enters a statement indicating such within the Compliance Tracking Tool, which then sends the LEA, in written form, confirmation that noncompliance, has been verified as corrected. SDE's method for verifying correction is consistent with guidance provided in OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and the September 3, 2008 Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance.

### Reverification of Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator was 98%.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	39
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	39
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected (beyond the one-year timeline)	0

### Describe the specific actions that the state took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

In FFY 2009, for Indicator 11, there were 39 findings of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures and no dispute resolution findings of noncompliance.

All instances of noncompliance, found through the state's on-site monitoring system, other monitoring procedures, review of data collected by the state, including compliance data collected through the state data system, and by the (SDE) Department, are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool except for noncompliance found through the dispute resolution process. A separate database is used for tracking the correction and verification of dispute resolution findings. It is important to note, that all instances of noncompliance, including those identified through dispute resolution, are found and verified as corrected at the individual student level and at the district level. This is done by verifying that each LEA with a non-compliance identified in FFY 2009 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

These findings are verified as corrected at the individual student level. All Indicator 11 data is entered at a student level. Notice, in writing, is then sent to each LEA that includes the citation of the statute or regulation, a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data (including percentage levels of compliance) supporting the state's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation, and the requirement that noncompliance is to be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification, which is the date of written notification. The LEA and SDE collaborate to determine the root cause and design a plan for correction that may include, if needed, change to policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to, or resulted in noncompliance.

In addition, SDE staff reviewed subsequent data to verify that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements including a check to see if the most recent time specific 60-day timelines are compliant. After verification has occurred, the SDE staff enters a statement indicating such within the Compliance Tracking Tool, which then sends the LEA, in written form, confirmation that noncompliance, has been verified as corrected. SDE's method for verifying correction is consistent with guidance provided in OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and the September 3, 2008 Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	Between September and December 2012, the SDE undertook a review of FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 Indicator 11 compliance issues. On site visits were conducted on those districts receiving noncompliance letters in FFY 2009 (35 districts) and FFY 2010 (40 districts) to rereview records and review subsequent data to assure both individual and systemic corrections. The SDE is able to verify that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Provide training and technical assistance to districts with monitoring findings on this indicator based on analysis of data.	Ongoing	Training increased the initial quality of analysis and identification of needed improvements in the process of Child Find.
2011	Include this indicator in district determination decisions	June 2012	All districts received determination letters in June 2012 with Indicator 11 included.
2011	<p>Monitor initial evaluation timelines across monitoring activities both at the state level and the district level.</p> <p>Continue to evaluate the compliance (and timely correction of non-compliance) around this indicator through activities aligned with Indicator 15.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Districts received month newsletters with reminders of timelines/due dates.</p> <p>The SDE posted on its Special Education Web site due dates for both reports from districts and letters of compliance.</p> <p>The SDE designed a new Compliance Tracking Tool that includes reminder notices within the tool.</p>
2011	Provide ongoing monitoring and technical assistance to districts with more than three- year history of noncompliance and/or districts with large numbers (10 or more) of late evaluations.	Ongoing	Four districts have been identified for additional technical assistance.
2011	Work with the SDE IT department to identify upload coding errors, correct coding errors within programs, and establish gate-keeping to reject null submissions	Ongoing	<p>Child Find data are now uploaded through the SDE's ISEE platform. The IT department and Quality Assurance &amp; Reporting Coordinator have worked with all districts in problem solving upload issues.</p> <p>An upload guidance document was provided to districts in October 2012.</p> <p>The Quality Assurance &amp; Reporting Coordinator is conducting additional verification to assure accurate reporting.</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Work with the SDE IT department to identify upload coding errors, correct coding errors within programs, and establish gate-keeping to reject null submissions	Ongoing	Quality Assurance Coordinators Regional Coordinators VI-B funds	Assure the ISEE system is being utilized correctly for data uploads and additional verifications are in place to assist districts in accurate reporting.
2012	Include this indicator in district determination decisions	June 2012	Special Education Director Quality Assurance Coordinator VI-B funds	Provides additional feedback to districts on their implementation of Child Find requirements.
2012	Monitor initial evaluation timelines across monitoring activities both at the state level and the district level.  Continue to evaluate the compliance (and timely correction of non-compliance) around this indicator through activities aligned with Indicator 15.	Ongoing	Quality Assurance Coordinator Regional Coordinators VI-B funds	Assure timely correction of issues and improvement of systems to decrease noncompliance.



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Part C and Part B meet regularly to collaborate on improving the transition process. Materials are being jointly developed and joint training will be provided staff by each agency. The Special Education Advisory Panel is updated throughout the year, with input solicited.

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C, prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Measurement:

- Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthday.
- Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
- Number of children for who parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday.

Account for children included in 'a' but not included in 'b', 'c', 'd', or 'e'. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d – e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2010
2011	100%	99%

Data are collected from every school district via a web-based application. Data covers July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012. All districts submitted data as required. Further, interagency stakeholder groups have had several meetings to review data, discuss barriers, and to propose activities to improve timely transitions. This input is incorporated into the activities for this indicator.

#### Actual State Data (Numbers)

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	671
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	144
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by	499

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

their third birthday.	
d. Number of children for who parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.	14
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday. <i>[This information is not required until the 2011 submission but may be reported in 2010 if the State's data are available.]</i>	10
Number in a, but not in b, c, d, or e.	4
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.  Percent = $[(c) / (a-b-d-e)] * 100$	99.2%

Nine transitions from the Idaho Infant Toddler Program (Part C) were completed beyond the child's third birthday. Reasons are stated below.

Number of Late Transitions	Reason for Delay	Range of Days Late
6	Scheduling Issues	20-102
0	Medical Issue	
0	Child was being moved in Foster Care	0
1	Need for more testing	42
0	Other – file misplaced from Infant Toddler Program	0
9	<b>Totals</b>	20-102

### Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Progress: Results for Indicator 12 improved from 98% in FFY 2010 to 99% in FFY 2011. Timely transitions include eligibility and, if the child is found eligible, an IEP written and implemented by the child's third birthday. For transitions missing the child's third birthday, the number of days ranged from a minimum of 20 days late 102 days late.

### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator is 98%.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	9
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	9
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator is 98%.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	15
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	15
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected (beyond the one-year timeline)	0

### Verification of Correction:

In FFY 2010, for Indicator 12, there were 9 findings of noncompliance from nine LEAs identified through monitoring procedures and no dispute resolution findings of noncompliance. By reviewing data from all 9 LEAs the SDE verified all individual instances of noncompliance were corrected within one year. That is, an IEP was developed and implemented, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child was no longer with the jurisdiction.

Consistent with OSEP memorandum 09-02, all instances of noncompliance, found through the State's on-site monitoring system, other monitoring procedures, review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through the State data system, and by the Department are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool, except for noncompliance found through the dispute resolution process.

These findings are verified as corrected at the individual student level. All Indicator 12 data is entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool at a student level. Notice in writing is then sent to each LEA that includes the citation of the statute or regulation, a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data (including percentage levels of compliance) supporting the State's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation, and the requirement that noncompliance is to be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification, which is the date of written notification. The LEA and SDE collaborate to determine the root cause and design a plan for correction that may include, if needed, change to policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance.

Following the implementation of the plan for correction, SDE staff conducts an on-site follow-up review to verify correction of the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. SDE staff verifies correction of the individual instances of noncompliance for each LEA onsite. Verification of correction of noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement that is subject to a specific timeline includes verifying through file reviews that the LEA has provided the required action (i.e. evaluation, IEP and/or service), although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition, SDE staff reviewed subsequent data to verify that each LEA correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements including a check to see that an IEP was developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. After verification occurred, the SDE staff entered a statement indicating such, within the Compliance Tracking Tool, which was then sent to the LEA, in written form, confirming that noncompliance, had been verified as corrected. SDE's method for verifying correction is consistent with guidance provided in OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and the September 3, 2008 Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance.

In FFY 2009, for Indicator 12, there were 15 findings of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures and no dispute resolution findings of noncompliance. By reviewing data from the LEAs the SDE verified all individual instances of noncompliance were corrected within one year. That is, an IEP

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

was developed and implemented, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child was no longer with the jurisdiction.

Consistent with OSEP memorandum 09-02, all instances of noncompliance, found through the State's on-site monitoring system, other monitoring procedures, review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through the State data system, and by the Department are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool, except for noncompliance found through the dispute resolution process.

These findings are verified as corrected at the individual student level. All Indicator 12 data is entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool at a student level. Notice in writing is then sent to each LEA that includes the citation of the statute or regulation, a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data (including percentage levels of compliance) supporting the State's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation, and the requirement that noncompliance is to be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification, which is the date of written notification. The LEA and SDE collaborate to determine the root cause and design a plan for correction that may include, if needed, change to policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance.

Following the implementation of the plan for correction, SDE staff conducts an on-site follow-up review to verify correction of the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. SDE staff verifies correction of the individual instances of noncompliance for each LEA onsite. Verification of correction of noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement that is subject to a specific timeline includes verifying through file reviews that the LEA has provided the required action (i.e. evaluation, IEP and/or service), although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition, SDE staff reviewed subsequent data to verify that each LEA correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements including a check to assure that an IEP was developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. After verification occurred, the SDE staff entered a statement indicating such, within the Compliance Tracking Tool, which was then sent to the LEA, in written form, confirming that noncompliance, had been verified as corrected. SDE's method for verifying correction is consistent with guidance provided in OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and the September 3, 2008 Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing <b>34 CFR §300.301(c)(1)</b> (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data <b>subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</b> In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>Between September and December 2012, the SDE undertook a review of FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 Indicator 12 compliance issues. On site visits were conducted on those districts receiving noncompliance letters in FFY 2009 (13 districts) and FFY 2010 (1 districts) to re-review records and review subsequent data to assure both individual and systemic corrections. The SDE is able to verify that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing <b>34 CFR §300.124(b)</b> i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child <b>whose transition from Part C to Part B</b> was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed in FFY 2010:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
<b>2011</b>	Conduct onsite visits to assure correct implementation of the new Policy/Guidance, verified through file reviews.	May 2012 – December 2012	Conducted onsite monitoring visits to districts to assure both Prong II (individual) and Prong I (system) verification. Subsequent data examined and verified for Prong I.
<b>2011</b>	To ensure inter rater reliability during program reviews by Parts B & C regarding implementation of the new Policy/Guidance, develop a protocol and train on its use.	May 2012	Trainings have been conducted by the Early Childhood Coordinator and Regional Coordinators.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Provide an interagency collaborative training prior to school beginning to educate Headstart, ITP, and LEA preschool teachers on Interagency Agreements, best practice in collaborative teaming, transition procedures, and any policy changes from the previous year.	September 2012	Part C and B personnel Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	Inform and support districts in the implementation of new Part C regulations and Part C to Part B transition requirements
2012	Explore the feasibility of a data interface between Part C and Part B data systems to share transition data.	May 2013	Part C and B personnel Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	The SDE now receives names of students being referred to Part B. This allows cross verification of district reports and provides immediate data checks for transition activities.
2012	Conduct onsite visits to assure correct implementation of the new Policy/Guidance, verified through file reviews.	May 2013	Part C and B personnel Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	Assure timely correction of non-compliance at the Prong I and Prong II levels.
2012	Implement use of protocols to ensure appropriate policies and procedures are implemented in the LEAs and provide technical assistance as needed.	May 2013	Part C and B personnel Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	Allows cross verification of district reports and provides immediate data checks for transition activities.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

$$(133/421) 100 = 32\%$$

**The Process for Selecting LEAs for Monitoring:**

In accordance with OSEP's March 9, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) Letter, changes were made in the SDE's monitoring requirements and verification of correction of noncompliance. The most significant change in the SDE's monitoring activity is the move from a five year cycle of general supervision file reviews in which approximately 4/5 of districts were involved in the monitoring activity to a single file review activity in which all districts are required to participate on a yearly basis. All districts are monitored by the SDE annually.

Districts are expected to participate in the required monitoring activities in a timely and appropriate manner. All submitted data and reports will be accurate and timely.

**File Review Checklists:** The function of the file review is many-fold. It is a compliance monitoring tool, a tool for gathering data, and a learning tool. As a representation of the special education process, the information that is gained from the review of the special education student files is directly tied to the efforts districts make in improving services and programs for students with disabilities. Although a file review may be seen as a checklist of items not related to services, our efforts have been put towards establishing methods for looking at the process as a system and on an individual basis which provides data in which a root cause analysis is conducted. Checklists can be viewed on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website (<http://idahotc.com/continuous-improvement-monitoring-system/Home.aspx>) under documents.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The Secondary File Review, General File Review, and Preschool File Review will be completed on students who are part of a student list from the Idaho State Department of Education and available on the SDE Secure Server in September. This list is developed through a random sample that is stratified. The data gathered during these file reviews will be entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool student-by-student and a percentage is calculated on each item for the district to, again, enable them to analyze systems level issues as well. All districts will receive written notification of noncompliance within 90 days of discovery.

**CCV File Review Checklists:** The districts receive a randomized stratified list of students in February. They are to send to the SDE copies of the IEPs and Eligibility Reports so these files can be reviewed by teams. The teams include the LEA directors who are in Year 5 of CIMS, and regional and central office staff. The files are reviewed and entered into a database called the Compliance Tracking Tool.

### Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
2011 (2011-2012)	100%		
Number of IEPs Reviewed	Number of IEPs Compliant	Percent of IEPs Compliant	
421	133	32%	

### Districts with:

Year	Total number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP	Total number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements	Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements
FFY 2010	300	109	36%
FFY 2011	421	133	32%

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

Slippage: This year's data slipped to 32% compared to previous years' 36% of percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements. The results did not meet the 100% target.

Based on a review of results from districts conducting self-evaluation monitoring (SAM), these districts were inconsistent in their evaluation of student files which resulted in more findings of non-compliance than findings on files reviewed in March by the SDE during Child Count Verification (now called General Supervision File Reviews). Still, more districts had difficulty demonstrating appropriate IEP development for secondary students. Trainings have been developed and delivered (see improvement activities below) to address deficit areas of transition planning and IEP development.



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The SDE received the OSEP's Continuous Improvement Visit letter on March 9, 2012. Based on the findings, the SDE conducted monitoring of all districts and programs in the Fall of 2012 to establish systemic verification in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 for items identified as non-compliant in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years. Additional monitoring is being conducted to assure both individual correction and systemic compliance for items identified in the 2011-2012 school year monitoring activities.

### **Correcting and Verifying Correction of Noncompliance:**

Instances of noncompliance identified in Indicator 13 are found and verified as corrected at the individual student level and at the district level. This is done by verifying that each LEA with a non-compliance identified is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.320, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

The SDE verifies correction of all findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

- 1) The findings listed above account for all instances of noncompliance, including noncompliance identified through the Self -Assessment Monitoring (discontinued effective SY 2012-2013 and Child Count Verification (CCV). The SDE considers each individual instance of noncompliance, documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT) to be a finding of noncompliance.
- 2) Through required improvement activities and progress monitoring documented in the CTT, the SDE and LEA collaborate to identify the root cause(s) of the noncompliance and address those root causes. The Secondary Special Education Coordinator works with each LEA to identify trends in their data. LEAs participate in webinars addressing the specific requirements of each of the eight item based on the disaggregated data of the eight file review items contributing to Indicator 13 findings.
- 3) When needed, the SDE requires LEAs to change policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance with the secondary transition and IEP requirements.
- 4) The SDE determines, by reviewing subsequent student files, updated data, and through progress monitoring by SDE central office staff and/or regional coordinators, that each LEA correctly implements the IDEA requirements at 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and that any policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance have been addressed. In addition, the SDE verifies correction of each individual instance of noncompliance.

The SDE requires districts to submit corrected IEPs where noncompliance was found. The SDE verifies correction in each IEP to ensure correction of each instance of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition to verifying correction for each student whose IEP did not include the required components and evidence, the SDE also verifies correction by reviewing additional student files and district data that demonstrates that each district was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance). For review and verification of incidences occurring in SYs 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, these data were collected through an Excel workbook and onsite review of student records to verify the data reported. For findings of noncompliance with Indicator 13, requirements for correction and verification of correction varied based on the level of noncompliance:

- A. For 0% to 99% compliance, the LEA was required to implement a plan of correction that included conducting a root cause analysis of the non-compliance, develop improvement strategies

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

based on that analysis, conduct teacher/staff training on the specific standard that was out of compliance, identify policies and procedures (if any) contributing to noncompliance, and to submit subsequent data, collected following the implementation of the strategies that showed 100% compliance.

- B. If an LEA did not have new data (e.g., the SDE reviewed available files, found them to be compliant but was unable to fully assure systemic compliance because no additional Part B students are available for review) in the noncompliant category to provide as evidence for verification of correction at the end of the correction period, the SDE verified it had been corrected by reviewing and assuring proper policies, procedures and practices (specific regulatory requirements) were in place in the LEA.

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance:

7. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	54
8. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as meeting systemic compliance in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) and OSEP Memo 09-02	54
9. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

### Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 36%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	109
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	109
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0
Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):	
4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

FFY	Number of IEPs Reviewed	Number of IEPs Compliant	Percent of IEPs Compliant
2011	421	133	32%
2010	300	109	36%
2009 (corrected)	84	30	36%

Although we need to improve our overall percentage for Indicator 13, it is also important to look at the data collected for each sub question to analyze where our improvement efforts should focus. The table below provides the disaggregated data by each question. The four questions with the lowest percentages are measurable post school goals, age appropriate transition assessment, course of study, and student invitation. We will continue to provide statewide training, targeting these areas as well as all the components of Indicator 13 to move all of our percentages to our goal of 100% compliance on all IEPs.

Indicator Questions	Percent of IEPs that had the requirement in place				
	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
IEP includes measurable Post School Goals covering education/training, employment and as needed independent living	67%	70%	74%	72%	62%
Post School Goals are developed based on information gathered through age appropriate assessment in transition related areas, including a functional vocational evaluation if needed	60%	68%	73%	72%	63%
IEP includes a Course of Study (embedded or attached) to reach their Post School Goals	65%	79%	91%	72%	72%
IEP includes Transition Services (activities, related services) to reach their identified Post School Goals	78%	77%	89%	87%	81%
IEP annual goals assist the student to reach their identified Post School Goals	76%	80%	89%	81%	77%
If appropriate, a representative from an outside agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting	NA	NA	86%	86%	87%
Post School Goals are reviewed and updated annually as	NA	NA	93%	89%	87%

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

needed					
Student was invited to IEP meeting where transition services were discussed	NA	NA	92%	79%	91%

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator: Statement from the Response Table

“Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator.

When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and 2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining 54 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected.”

### State’s Response

FFY 2009: The SDE verified individual and systemic compliance all the 54 findings in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) and OSEP Memo 09-02.

FFY 2010: The SDE verified individual and systemic compliance of all 109 findings of non-compliance in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) and OSEP Memo 09-02.

### Correcting and Verifying Correction of Noncompliance:

Instances of noncompliance identified in Indicator 13 are found and verified as corrected at the individual student level and at the district level. This is done by verifying that each LEA with a non-compliance identified is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.320, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

The SDE verifies correction of all findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

- 5) The findings listed above account for all instances of noncompliance, including noncompliance identified through the Self-Assessment Monitoring (discontinued effective SY 2012-2013 and Child Count Verification (CCV). The SDE considers each individual instance of noncompliance, documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT) to be a finding of noncompliance.
- 6) Through required improvement activities and progress monitoring documented in the CTT, the SDE and LEA collaborate to identify the root cause(s) of the noncompliance and address those

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

root causes. The Secondary Special Education Coordinator works with each LEA to identify trends in their data. LEAs participate in webinars addressing the specific requirements of each of the eight item based on the disaggregated data of the eight file review items contributing to Indicator 13 findings.

- 7) When needed, the SDE requires LEAs to change policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance with the secondary transition and IEP requirements.
- 8) The SDE determines, by reviewing subsequent student files, updated data, and through progress monitoring by SDE central office staff and/or regional coordinators, that each LEA correctly implements the IDEA requirements at 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and that any policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance have been addressed. In addition, the SDE verifies correction of each individual instance of noncompliance.

The SDE requires districts to submit corrected IEPs where noncompliance was found. The SDE verifies correction in each IEP to ensure correction of each instance of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition to verifying correction for each student whose IEP did not include the required components and evidence, the SDE also verifies correction by reviewing additional student files and district data that demonstrates that each district was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance). For review and verification of incidences occurring in SYs 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, these data were collected through an Excel workbook and onsite review of student records to verify the data reported. For findings of noncompliance with Indicator 13, requirements for correction and verification of correction varied based on the level of noncompliance:

- C. For 0% to 99% compliance, the LEA was required to implement a plan of correction that included conducting a root cause analysis of the non-compliance, develop improvement strategies based on that analysis, conduct teacher/staff training on the specific standard that was out of compliance, identify policies and procedures (if any) contributing to noncompliance, and to submit subsequent data, collected following the implementation of the strategies that showed 100% compliance.
- D. If an LEA did not have new data (e.g., the SDE reviewed available files, found them to be compliant but was unable to fully assure systemic compliance because no additional Part B students are available for review) in the noncompliant category to provide as evidence for verification of correction at the end of the correction period, the SDE verified it had been corrected by reviewing and assuring proper policies, procedures and practices (specific regulatory requirements) were in place in the LEA.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Secondary Transition develops a secondary team that includes an administrator in order to build district capacity. Smaller districts may form a regional team including the regional coordinators and an experienced mentor.	September 2012 data was analyzed to identify aggregated district compliance rates.	Based on Idaho's OSEP determination and indicator 13 data (60% of Idaho school districts who were monitored for Indicator 13 had a 0% aggregated rate of compliance) the SDE chose to focus resources on statewide training in all 8 components of Indicator 13.  The SDE needs to consider if this activity is realistic based on the current indicator 13 data.
2011	Training and technical assistance will be provided to LEAs on data collection and reporting process.	Began developing the system with the assistance of OSEP in April 2012 and the SDE has provided multiple webinars on the process fall 2012.	The SDE Special Education Director and SDE Quality Assurance & Reporting Coordinator conducted four webinar meetings with district special education directors outlining new general supervision file review processes and OSEP findings requiring revisiting of FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 monitoring activities.  The SDE needs to continue to provide training on the new reporting and data collection process.
2011	Data will be collected, analyzed and reported to the public.	March 2012	The SDE collected data in March 2012 during Child Count Verification and will report that data to the public in the FFY 2012 APR.
2011	Training and technical assistance will be provided to LEAs on the use of data in the self-evaluation and improvement activity development.	May 2012 to December 2012	Webinars and individual communications were provided to districts to complete identification, improvement activities, and progress monitoring within the Compliance Tracking Tool.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Continue to enhance online resources through the Secondary Transition Learning Community	Completed update and addition of resources in November 2012	<p>All secondary training materials are posted on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse for additional downloads for those not able to attend the trainings. In the 3rd quarter the secondary transition documents page ranked 8<sup>th</sup> as most visited page on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse with almost 1000 views, the secondary transition home page was 11<sup>th</sup> with almost 700 views, and the resources was 18<sup>th</sup> with 442 views.  <a href="http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.asp">http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.asp</a></p> <p>The SDE needs to develop additional resources for annual goal writing, specifically for organizational goals and resources for selecting appropriate transition assessment based on students' identified postsecondary goals.</p>
<b>2011</b>	Collaborate with the Idaho Training Clearinghouse to develop and support a Secondary Transition Learning Community to provide on-line and traditional training formats.	Began cohort 2 in September 2012. Completed module 1 in October 2012, completed module 2 in November 2012, set to begin module 3 in January 2013.	<p>The SDE began a 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort of educators completing the 5 secondary transition modules that was developed by the state. 17 completed module 1, 7 teachers completed module 2 and 8 are enrolled in module 3.</p> <p>The SDE needs to improve its' recruiting practices to have more educators take part in the online modules. The SDE needs to provide facilitation of modules 3, 4, and 5 scheduled to take place in January, February, and March 2013.  <a href="http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Home.aspx">http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Home.aspx</a></p>
<b>2011</b>	Utilize the cadre of mentors consisting of master level practitioners in the field of secondary transition to assist in delivering training and technical assistance to professionals, youth and families across Idaho.	September 2012- module 1, October 2012- module 2, January 2013- module 3.	The SDE has been working with one secondary transition mentor to provide online training across the state. The selection of only using one mentor was to help increase consistency in the module facilitation.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Use online and face-to-face training and offer mini-workshop improvement activities for Indicator 13 around the state.	June 2012- summer training. October and November 2012- Fall Trainings	<p>Summer training (6 trainings = 48 hours of training): Out of 149 districts, 88 districts attended the training. Of the 61 districts that did not attend, 29 schools were charter schools (13 of which are K-8), and only 11 of the 61 districts that did not attend have over 100 students on IEPs in the district. The other 21 districts have fewer than 100 students on IEPs in the district.</p> <p>Of the districts who attended, 11 districts had low representation (sent between 1-3 teachers for districts with students up to 1171 students on IEPs)</p> <p>Regional coordinators, secondary special education coordinator, and the special population's coordinator have contacted each district/charter explaining the importance of sending representation or greater representation to the Fall trainings.</p> <p>Fall training (8 trainings = 64 hours of training): Out of 149 districts, only 7 districts/charters that have secondary students did not attend the training. Of the 7 districts that did not attend, 2 schools were charter schools, and only 2 of the remaining 5 districts have over 100 students on IEPs in the district.</p>
<b>2011</b>	Support and utilize the Transition Leadership cadre, including higher education faculty to address the statewide training needs in pre-service and in-service for professional, paraprofessional and parent training.	Fall 2012	<p>The SDE is working with 3 local universities to include indicator 13 state developed materials with in-service teachers.</p> <p>The SDE needs to increase the use of these materials with all pre-service teachers and collaborate with IHEs for in-service professional development.</p>



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Disseminate guidelines for number of IEPs to be reviewed by each district (5 IEPs or 1%, whichever is greater)	SDE has provided multiple webinars on the process fall 2012.	<p>The SDE Director of Special Education and SDE Quality Assurance &amp; Reporting Coordinator conducted four informational webinars with district special education directors specific to the General Supervision File Review process. 40% of files reviewed will be secondary files.</p> <p>The SDE needs to continue to provide training on the new reporting and data collection process.</p>
<b>2011</b>	Modify the current Idaho secondary transition checklist and directions used to determine district compliance on Indicator 13 to align with the NSTTAC (National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center) checklist.	Modified the checklist and directions in January 2012, provided summer trainings in June 2012 and fall trainings in October and November 2012.	<p>The secondary checklist and directions have been modified to meet the federal guidelines. 6 Summer regional trainings have been provided and 8 Fall regional trainings have been provided on the new checklist and directions requirements.</p> <p><a href="http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx">http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx</a> (under tab Transition and IEPs)</p>
<b>2011</b>	Develop a compliance guidance package to be disseminated to all state special education directors that include ways to meet Indicator 13 compliance requirements.	<p>Developed guidance in April and May 2012</p> <p>Posted training materials on the ITC June 2012</p>	<p>Developed material and created 250 notebooks for teachers/administrators that were distributed at the summer trainings and 450 notebooks were distributed at the fall trainings.</p> <p>All training materials are posted on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) for those not able to attend the trainings. In the last quarter ST documents page ranked 8<sup>th</sup> as most visited page on the ITC with almost 1000 views, the ST home page was 11<sup>th</sup> with almost 700 views, and the resources was 18<sup>th</sup> with 442 views.</p> <p><a href="http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx">http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx</a></p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Develop a statewide training in the 6 regions of the state on how to meet the compliance requirements of Indicator 13.	<del>Summer</del> <del>2012</del> Developed training in April and May 2012	<p>Trainings were developed and provided in all six regions in the summer and a follow-up training was provided in all 6 regions (8 trainings) was provided in the fall.</p> <p>91 of 149 (13 of these charters do not have secondary students) districts/charters sent representation to the summer training and 129 of 149 (13 of these charters do not have secondary students) sent representation to the fall training.</p>
<b>2011</b>	Develop a follow up training on the compliance requirements of Indicator 13.	<p>Focus groups on training were completed in June 2012</p> <p>New materials and guidance were created in August 2012</p>	<p>Following the training, pilot groups (2-4 people/group) in each region were interviewed to provide feedback on changes to make to the trainings. These suggestions were used along with the training evaluation to update the training.</p> <p>Developed material and created 450 notebooks for teachers/administrators that were distributed at the trainings.</p> <p>All training materials are posted on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) for those not able to attend the trainings.  <a href="http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx">http://idahotc.com/secondary-transition/Documents.aspx</a></p> <p>The SDE also developed a series of 8 webinars that explain the Indicator 13 compliance components of writing a secondary IEP. The webinars were provided and recorded. The recorded webinars are housed on the ITC for districts/charters to watch.</p> <p>The SDE will use the data from Child Count Verification to target districts based on disaggregated Indicator 13 data in order to compel districts/charters to view the appropriate recorded webinars based on data of non-compliance.</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Monitor and cross check to assure all 8 components of Indicator 13 are used for reporting statewide compliance	<p>System on monitoring process was developed in May 2012</p> <p>System for consistency check was developed in September 2012</p>	<p>Developed a system to monitor IEPs based on date the IEP was written. For Child Count Verification in March, will group the IEP into 2 categories, IEPs written before the trainings were offered and IEPs written after the trainings were provided to see if the SDE compliance rates improved following the trainings.</p> <p>Also developed a system where all secondary IEPs monitored during Child Count Verification in March 2013 will be monitored by the regional monitors and then cross-checked by the secondary special education coordinator to increase consistency in monitoring.</p> <p>The SDE will need to use the data collected on differences in monitoring practices. If the results indicate inconsistencies in monitoring practices, the SDE will need to develop and provide training on consistent monitoring,</p>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:**

<b>Improvement Activities for Indicator # 13</b>				
<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>2012 (2012-2013)</b>	Training and technical assistance will be provided to LEAs on data collection and reporting process.	Annually Summer and Fall	<p>Secondary Special Education Coordinator</p> <p>SDE Regional Coordinator</p> <p>Secondary Transition Interagency Council</p> <p>Part B funds</p>	In order to have usable data that easily can be retrieved at a later stage for further comparison and analysis the SDE needs to be sure school districts are collecting and reporting data correctly. Proper data collection and reporting will provide

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				the SDE with information on systemic concerns regarding the writing of compliant secondary IEPs.
<b>2012</b>	Data will be collected, analyzed and reported to the public.	Annually Fall	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Part B funds	In order to meet IDEA 2004's regulations Subpart F § 300.600 State monitoring and enforcement the Idaho State Department of Education will monitor, analyze, and report Indicator 13 data to the public.
<b>2012</b>	Training and technical assistance will be provided to LEAs on the use of data in the self-evaluation and improvement activity development.	Annually Winter	SDE Secondary Special Education Coordinator Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator Part B Funds	A core element of whole school reform is the comprehensive improvement plan, and an important feature of any comprehensive improvement plans is using data
<b>2012</b>	Continue to enhance online resources through the Secondary Transition Learning Community	Ongoing	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Secondary Transition Interagency Coordinating Council Part B Funds	One advantage of online resources is that information can be updated immediately, without the need to wait for the next print publication date. Educational legislation changes can be incorporated into online resources. Also online resources can be disseminated easily to all areas of the state.
<b>2012</b>	Partner with the Idaho Training Clearinghouse to develop and support a Secondary Transition Learning Community to provide on-line and	Ongoing	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Regional Coordinators Part B funds	Providing educators in a large rural state multiple delivery methods for acquiring training on writing compliant secondary IEPs will increase the

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	traditional training formats.			number of educators accessing content. SDE data has indicated that educators are utilizing both online and traditional training formats for training on writing a secondary IEP that meets federal compliance requirements.
<b>2012</b>	Use online and face-to-face training through the Secondary Transition Learning Community to offer mini-workshops on topics related to the key indicators for secondary transition twice a year in eight locations around the state.	Ongoing	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Secondary Transition Interagency Coordinating Council Part B funds	SDE data has indicated that educators are assessing both online and face-to-face training for training on writing a secondary IEP that meets federal compliance requirements. In order to target specific districts in writing compliant secondary IEPs the SDE has broken this activity into one activity focuses on on-line training and one focuses on face-to-face training.
<b>2012</b>	Utilize the cadre of mentors consisting of master level practitioners in the field of secondary transition to assist in delivering training and technical assistance to professionals, youth and families across Idaho.	Discontinued	Discontinued	Assessment data conducted by SESTA (Special Education Statewide Technical Assistance) determined that this practice was leading to inconsistent messages on compliance requirements being communicated around the state. The secondary special education coordinator provided all the

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				trainings to increase training consistency.
<b>2012</b>	Support and utilize the Transition Leadership cadre, including higher education faculty to address the statewide training needs in preservice and inservice for professional, paraprofessional and parent training.	Discontinued	Discontinued	Assessment data conducted by SESTA (Special Education Statewide Technical Assistance) determined that inconsistent messages on compliance requirements were communicated around the state. In order to create uniform trainings that provide a consistent message to the field and are executed with fidelity in the different regions of the state the secondary special education coordinator developed materials, webinars, and presentation material to be used in training pre-service and in-service educators.
<b>2012</b>	Increase teacher compliance in conducting transition assessment with students the SDE will develop and train on selecting appropriate transition assessment based on students' identified postsecondary goals.	November 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator NSTTAC Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	Federal law requires "appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments" (§300.320[b][1]). NSTTAC states that "assessment is used to develop post-school goals, and related transition services and annual goals and objectives for the transition component of the IEP, to make instructional programming decisions, and to include information in the present level of

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				performance related to a student's interests, preferences, and needs in the IEP.” Teacher need to learn proper selection of assessment to develop compliant and meaningful IEPs.
<b>2012</b>	To improve teacher knowledge of evidence based practices in secondary transition; the SDE will develop strategies to improve teacher completion of the 5 online modules.	September 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator NSTTAC Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	Facilitates the ability to provide training and improve practice while limiting the money spent by school districts. The retention rate is approximately 40% completion of all 5 modules. The SDE needs to increase the number of participants completing all five modules to increase teacher knowledge in evidence-based practices.
<b>2012</b>	To increase pre-service teacher compliance in writing compliant Indicator 13 IEPs, the SDE will collaborate with IHE faculty to use SDE developed materials when providing IEP writing instruction.	October 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Secondary Transition Interagency Council Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	In order to provide a consistent message to pre-service teachers that are executed with fidelity IHEs need to be provided with current state approved materials and trainings that can be used during instruction.
<b>2012</b>	To increase teacher compliance in writing compliant Indicator 13 IEPs, the SDE will use disaggregated data from Child Count Verification to provided targeted intensive professional development to districts/charters falling below 100% compliance.	September 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator NSTTAC Regional Coordinators Part B Funds	In order to increase Indicator 13 compliance the SDE is following a similar process of SIG (School Improvement Grants). The process of targeting lowest-performing schools has had encouraging results. Secretary of

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				Education Duncan remarked, “in roughly 60 percent of SIG schools, the percent of students who were proficient in math or reading went up in the first year of the program”. The SDE believes following the model of the SIG program will lead to similar results in secondary IEP compliance rates.
--	--	--	--	---



**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 14:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

<b>Measurable and Rigorous Targets</b>	<b>2011</b>
14.A. Enrolled in higher education within one year	18.3%
14.B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year	37.0%
14.C. Enrolled in higher education, other postsecondary education or training, competitively employed, or in some other employment within one year	71.1%

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Actual Target Data for 2011:

Measurable and Rigorous Targets	2011
14.A. Enrolled in higher education within one year	19%
14.B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year	32%
14.C. Enrolled in higher education, other postsecondary education or training, competitively employed, or in some other employment within one year	75%

One year after students left school, including those who graduated, dropped out, or aged out, 71.1% were engaged in either post-secondary education or employment. Data is collected through a contractor, LifeTrack Services Inc., with initial contact made by the SDE through an introduction letter and written survey. To ensure a high response rate the contractor follows up with one additional written contact by mail. If a response is not received, a phone interview is conducted. The interviewer will attempt to contact the student up to three times by phone to conduct the interview. Responses are considered valid if reported by the student or the parent of the student.

Data taken for leavers during the 2010-2011 school year (481 Surveys)	#	%
1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (should be same as 14A)	88	18.3%
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education)	90	18.7%
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	57	12.1%
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed)	107	22.2%
<b>Total Engaged</b>	342	71.1%

### Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Idaho conducts a census survey of all leavers one year after exiting high school. Every district is included every year. This includes both graduates and dropouts, including those who age out without graduating. In addition to this requirement, Idaho began surveying exiting students beginning with the Class of 2000 and is continuing to survey exiting students prior to departure, as well as one year and three years after exiting. Prior to exiting, an online survey is taken at the high school. Post exit surveys are contracted with LifeTrack Services Inc. The State provides contact information and LifeTrack follows up by mailing surveys and making up to three phone calls in an effort to contact non-responders or their parents to complete the survey by phone. The overall response rate is 54.8% as noted in the table below. The 832 targeted leavers were students who aged out, graduated or dropped out. Overall, the number of targeted leavers was less in this year's respondent group due to the original organization of cohort districts. Respondents are representative of completers and dropouts.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	SLD	CI	Speech	Language
Target Leaver Totals	832	401	86	3	42
Response Totals	481	212	47	3	22
Response Rate	57.8%	52.9%	54.7%	100.0%	52.4%
Target Leaver Representation		48.2%	10.3%	0.4%	5.0%
Respondent Representation		44.1%	9.8%	0.6%	4.6%
Difference		-4.1%	-0.6%	0.3%	-0.5%

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	ED	OHI	OI	Deaf
Target Leaver Totals	832	43	142	2	1
Response Totals	481	21	87	0	1
Response Rate	57.8%	48.8%	61.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Target Leaver Representation		5.2%	17.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Respondent Representation		4.4%	18.1%	0.0%	0.2%
Difference		-0.8%	1.0%	-0.2%	0.1%

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	HI	VI	D/B	Multiple
Target Leaver Totals	832	14	4	1	19
Response Totals	481	6	3	0	12
Response Rate	57.8%	42.9%	75.0%	0.0%	63.2%
Target Leaver Representation		1.7%	0.5%	0.1%	2.3%
Respondent Representation		1.2%	0.6%	0.0%	2.5%
Difference		-0.4%	0.1%	-0.1%	0.2%

**Note:** positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation.

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	Autism	TBI
Target Leaver Totals	832	66	8
Response Totals	481	45	3
Response Rate	57.8%	68.2%	37.5%
Target Leaver Representation		7.9%	1.0%
Respondent Representation		9.4%	0.6%
Difference		1.4%	-0.3%

**Note:** positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian
Target Leaver Totals	832	6	12	55	21
Response Totals	481	6	6	28	12
Response Rate	57.8%	100.0%	50.0%	50.9%	57.1%
Target Leaver Representation		0.7%	1.4%	6.6%	2.5%
Respondent Representation		1.2%	1.2%	5.8%	2.5%
Difference		0.5%	-0.2%	-0.8%	0.0%

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Two or more	White
Target Leaver Totals	832	5	61	672
Response Totals	481	4	28	378
Response Rate	57.8%	80.0%	45.9%	56.3%
Target Leaver Representation		0.6%	7.3%	80.8%
Respondent Representation		0.8%	5.8%	78.6%
Difference		0.2%	-1.5%	-2.2%

**Note:** positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation.

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	Female	Male
Target Leaver Totals	832	288	544
Response Totals	481	151	311
Response Rate	57.8%	52.4%	57.2%
Target Leaver Representation		34.6%	65.4%
Respondent Representation		31.4%	64.7%
Difference		-3.2%	-0.7%

**Note:** positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation.

Response Rate By Demographics	Overall	Graduated	Age Out	Drop Out
Target Leaver Totals	832	621	58	153
Target Leaver Representation		74.6%	7.0%	18.4%

**Note:** Exiting status demographic data was extrapolated by matching student lists provided to LifeTrack Services Inc. to exiting data collected by the SDE.

Idaho has been collecting secondary school leaver and post school outcome data for all students receiving special education services beginning with the graduating class of 2000 through a contractor who uses a State customized survey to gather information. The total number of students in Idaho who leave a secondary program, regardless of reason, are contacted and provided an opportunity to complete a survey.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The current process is designed for students to complete a survey prior to leaving secondary school programs, then one year and three years after exiting school. This data has been used both at the state and local levels to identify areas of need and assist in the development of activities to address these needs.

For the purposes of reporting and analyzing the data presented, the following definitions are used:

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two year program). It also includes youth who have gone on a church mission.

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.) and

Leavers are counted in only one of the above categories and the categories are organized hierarchically.

	Questions	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
14. A	Enrolled in higher education within one year	17%	22%	18.3%
14. B	Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year	31%	41%	37.0%
14. C	Enrolled in higher education, other postsecondary education or training, competitively employed, or in some other employment within one year	71%	78%	71.1%

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011:

Measure A: Slippage – FFY 2011 actual data of 18.3% was lower than that of FFY 2010 by 3.7%. The Rigorous and Measurable Target of 19% was not met.

Measure B: Slippage – FFY 2011 actual data of 37.0% was lower than that of FFY 2010 by 4.0%. The Rigorous and Measurable Target of 32% was met.

Measure C: Slippage– FFY 2011 actual data of 71.1% was lower than that of FFY 2010 by 6.9%. The Rigorous and Measurable Target of 75% was not met.

We attribute slippage, in part, to the following factors:

1. We assured this years' survey cohort included students who dropped out. Attendance and employment for students who drop out are historically lower than those who complete their secondary education.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

2. Although we realized a higher response rate from the cohort, the number of students contacted was lower than previous years.
3. Enrollment in Idaho's institutions of higher education was higher (approximately 5%) in the last two years making acceptance to these institutions more competitive. Additionally, of those enrolling in Idaho's institutions of higher education, in the last two years, a greater number are non-traditional (older) students and displaced workers.  
([http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/research\\_stats/postsecondary\\_data.asp](http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/research_stats/postsecondary_data.asp))
4. Youth unemployment in Idaho remains higher than the national average with over 20% of youth ages 16 to 24 unemployed. Employment in agriculture, Idaho largest employment sector, remains stagnate.  
(<http://www.aecf.org/~media/Pubs/Initiatives/KIDS%20COUNT/Y/youthandworkpolicyreport/kidscountyouthandwork.pdf>)
5. There is initial evidence of an increase in students remaining in or reenrolling in 18 to 21 year old programs with LEAs although we have no specific data for this cohort at this time.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State did not include dropouts in the data set as required by the measurement. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its targets.	The SDE was able to verify inclusion of students who dropped out in this years' survey by cross-walking district provided data with prior year child count and exiting data.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Work with stakeholder groups to review exit and post school data and develop improvement activity plans, timeline and resources.	Fall 2011	<p>Quarterly meeting (September, January, April, June) set with IICST (Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition). Includes representatives from: Department of Labor, Assistive Technology Project, Idaho Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired, High School Transition Teacher, Disability Services from state universities, and community colleges, Professional Technological Education, Department of Corrections, Juvenile Corrections, Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind, Disability Rights Idaho, Vocational Rehabilitation, Health and Welfare, Idaho Council on Disabilities, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Special Education Higher Education Faculty, and the State Department of Education.</p> <p>Group members used post-school data to help develop a timeline and graduation guidance document that is available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse. Group members also provided Disability Mentoring Day in 3 regions of the state with 122 student participants attending.</p>
2011	At the state level, develop a community transition team utilizing the Idaho Interagency Council to expand and coordinate secondary transition activities across the state.	Oct. 2011	One additional community transition team was developed in Northern Idaho. Currently Boise School District is working to develop a community transition for the southwest region of Idaho.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Post-secondary disability service coordinators from all Idaho IHEs will meet on a bi-annual basis to identify and implement improvement activities to increase post-secondary enrollment of students within one year of leaving secondary school.	Spring 2012	<p>4 IHEs participate in quarterly IICST (Idaho interagency Council on Secondary transition meetings with the SDE. The groups created a goal statement: to increase the number of young with disabilities who are actively engaged in postsecondary education, employment, and community activities. The group developed suggestions for a transition teacher evaluation, collected baseline data on numbers of young adults assessing adult services and postsecondary IHEs, collected data on the use of the Moving on Binder, collaborated on development of the Tools for Life conference, and created a protocol form that can be used to collect data on postsecondary related activities.</p> <p>The SDE needs to solicit all the IHEs in the state to attend the interagency council meetings.</p>



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Collaborate with the Center on Disabilities and Human Development and the University of Idaho to host “Tools for Life” for high school students to help prepare them for college and adult living. Add a pre- or post-session for educators working with secondary students with disabilities.	March 2012	<p>Tools for Life number of attendees: 320 (33 educators, 124 students, 52 family members, 79 professionals, 11 vendors, 13 college mentors, 8 self-advocate adults).</p> <p>Tools for Life had 13 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about self-determination.</p> <p>Tools for Life had 5 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about self-advocacy.</p> <p>Tools for Life had 7 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about community living.</p> <p>Tools for Life had 11 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about employment.</p> <p>Tools for Life had 11 conference sessions directed to families and students with disabilities about postsecondary education and assistive technology.</p> <p>A pre or post session was not added.</p>
<b>2011</b>	Host Youth Leadership Forum, a week-long leadership, citizenship, and career development program for high school juniors and seniors with disabilities.	March 2012	Youth Leadership Forum was not provided because of the lack of funding and manpower needed to support the forum. The forum only provides participation to a small number of students.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Expand Secondary Transition Mentors program.	March 2012	<p>Included in online secondary transition training provided by SDE and secondary mentors to school districts. 5 secondary mentors completed the online training modules developed and facilitated by the SDE. Two school districts selected 8 district representatives to participate in the online training with the SDE.</p> <p>Two secondary mentors were selected to facilitate the modules now available to all school districts.</p>
<b>2011</b>	<p><del>HC</del> and ISU Disabilities Resource Center collaborate to host “Explore College Day” for high school students with disabilities. Include a panel for parents to gain information to help prepare their student for college.</p>	Oct. 2011	<p>Idaho State University (ISU), Disability Services offered a series of workshops for local high school juniors and seniors with disabilities. The participants in the surveys included 138 high school juniors and seniors from eastern Idaho. Each student attended workshops about disability accommodations, things every college student should know, and financial planning.</p> <p>Students showed statistically significant improvement in the following areas: I know how to apply for college admission (z score of -5.595), I know how to apply for financial aid (z score of -4.792), I understand the skills a person needs to go to college (z score of -2.885), I can list and discuss the accommodations I need to be successful (z score of -2.954), I feel comfortable discussing my disability (z score of -2.999). There was not a significant difference in my high school has prepared me to request accommodation in college (z score of -2.463) or I know how much education or training I need to get a good job (z score of -.906).</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Work with NPSO (National Post School Outcomes Center) to develop a census survey for Idaho students who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEPs in effect at the time they left school and aligns to the survey questions developed by NPSO.	February 2012 – August 2012	Developed a new survey matching the first 8 questions to the NPSO survey. Contacted and meet with TAESE ( <i>Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education</i> ) on improving data collected in the survey.
<b>2011</b>	Increase the response numbers of the population of students contacted in the census to include students who have graduated, dropped out, and those who have aged out of high school without graduating.	February 2012 – August 2012	Contacted and meet with TAESE ( <i>Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education</i> ) on improving data collected in the survey. Selected TAESE to be our new vendor for collecting Indicator 14 data. Made a few changes to our data collection questionnaire to match NPSO's questionnaire and questions that will provide data current state initiatives that link to increased post-school success. Contacting all school districts to receive contact information on students who have dropped out of school.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012**

<b>Improvement Activities for Indicator # 14</b>				
<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>2012</b>	Collaborate with the Center on Disabilities and Human Development and the University of Idaho to host "Tools for Life" for high school students to help prepare them for college and adult living.	March 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Part B funds AT Project funds	Helps prepare students with disabilities for college and career readiness  NSTTAC (National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center) conducted a literature review that identified more than 15 evidence-based predictors of post-school employment, education, and independent living success from the correlational research. The Tools for Life conference provides

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				instruction in 8 of these 15 evidence based practices: career awareness, community experiences, interagency collaboration, parental involvement, self-advocacy/self-determination, self-care/independent living skills, social skills, and vocational education.
<b>2012</b>	Post-secondary disability service coordinators from all Idaho IHEs will meet on a bi-annual basis to identify and implement improvement activities to increase post-secondary enrollment of students within one year of leaving secondary school.	April 2013 and September 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator Part B funds	Interagency collaboration facilitates strong linkages to adult agencies, which is positively correlated to educational post-school success (Kohler & Field, 2003; Repetto, Webb, Garvan & Washington, 2002). In order to gain knowledge regarding the different IHE system requirements increasing collaboration between IHEs to identify and implement improvement activities will positively impact post-school outcome in education.
<b>2012</b>	Through IIC, provide mini grants for secondary transition projects.	Fall 2012	Discontinued	The Idaho State Department of Education is not able to commit to sponsoring multiple mini grants because of the lack of funding to support multiple projects. According to IDVR (Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation), in FFY 2011 -635

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

				transition age individuals were successfully employed after receiving services from IDVR. (RSA federal definition- under age 25 at application for IDVR). In FFY 2011 IDVR served 1561 that were identified as attending high school at time the IDVR application were taken. In order to increase the number of students competitively employed the SDE needs to fund interagency workshops between district employees and IDVR staff.
<b>2012</b>	To increase the number of youth competitively employed for 90 days or more, at or above minimum wage, in a setting with his or her non-disabled peers, the SDE will partner with Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation to develop an interagency workshop for VR counselors and secondary special educators that targets proper documentation of eligibility and accommodation/ adaptation needs, communication strategies between agencies, and evidence based instruction for teaching employment skills.	Fall 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator  IDVR- Chief of Field Services  Part B Finds	In responses to the question; “ did your high school program help connect you to a job, college, or community agency such as Voc. Rehab, Social Security, Commission for the Blind, etc.?” 40% of the 450 replied, “no”. In order to increase the number of youth being connected to an adult agency proving professional development to both districts and VR together will increase communication and collaboration between these entities.
<b>2012</b>	To increase the number of youth with specific learning disabilities (-4.1%) and females (-3.2%) who respond to the post-school outcome survey,	March 2013- November 2013	Secondary Special Education Coordinator  Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator	For over 30 year TAESE has been the technical assistance divisions of the Center for Persons with Disabilities at Utah

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	the SDE will partner with TAESE ( <i>Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education</i> ) to develop a data collection systems that specifically target youth from these underrepresented groups; the SDE will also track the responses of these groups during the data collection period to monitor response rates.		Special Education Director TAESE Associate Director  Part B funds	State University, where they help State agencies improve outcomes for youth with disabilities. They currently work with other State Departments of Education on data collection and data analysis of Indicator 14 data. Both states are satisfied with the assistance.
<b>2012</b>	Collect data to run initial analysis of regional differences in outcomes, students remaining in 18-21 year programs with LEAs, and students returning to LEAs to complete programs.	October 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator  Part B funds	Establish a baseline of longitudinal data for revisions of the SPP and future planning for Results Driven Accountability.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 15:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

#### Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. Percent of findings of noncompliance
- b. Percent of corrections completed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	100%

#### Actual Target Data:

FFY	Target	Actual
2005	100 %	93.0 %
2006	100 %	87.8 %
2007	100 %	100%
2008	100 %	100%
2009	100%	100%
2010	100%	OSEP calculation 1.26% based on FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table
Review of 2009	100%	100%
Review of 2010	100%	100%
2011	100%	100%

#### The Process for Selecting LEAs for Monitoring:

In accordance with OSEP's March 9, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) Letter, changes were made in the SDE's monitoring requirements and verification of correction of noncompliance. The most significant change in the SDE's monitoring activity is the move from a five year cycle of general

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

supervision file reviews in which approximately 4/5 of districts were involved in the monitoring activity to a single file review activity in which all districts are required to participate on a yearly basis. All districts are monitored by the SDE annually.

Districts are expected to participate in the required monitoring activities in a timely and appropriate manner. All submitted data and reports must be accurate and timely.

**File Review Checklists:** The function of the file review is many-fold. It is a compliance monitoring tool, a tool for gathering data, and a learning tool. As a representation of the special education process, the information that is gained from the review of the special education student files is directly tied to the efforts districts make in improving services and programs for students with disabilities. Although a file review may be seen as a checklist of items not related to services, our efforts have been put towards establishing methods for looking at the process as a system and on an individual basis which provides data in which a root cause analysis is conducted.

The Secondary File Review, General File Review, and Preschool File Review are completed on students who are part of a student list from the Idaho State Department of Education and available on the SDE Secure Server in September. This list is developed through a random sample that is stratified to include traditional programs, charters, alternative programs, online, and hybrid programs. The data gathered during these file reviews will be entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool student-by-student and a percentage is calculated on each item for the district to, again, enable them to analyze systems level issues as well. All districts will receive written notification of noncompliance within 90 days of discovery.

**CCV File Review Checklists:** The districts receive a randomized stratified list of students in February. They are to send to the SDE copies of the IEPs and Eligibility Reports so these files can be reviewed by teams. The teams include the LEA directors who are in Year 5 of CIMS, and regional and central office staff. The files are reviewed and entered into a database called the Compliance Tracking Tool.

**Compliance Identification, Correction and Verification:** A database, the Compliance Tracking Tool, is used to record, track, and monitor the findings to support the LEAs as well as the State in successfully tracking correction of noncompliance. Findings, through the monitoring process, are based on individual child records and the review of administrative policies, practices, and procedures, which are recorded in the Compliance Tracking Tool. In addition to verifying correction of findings based on individual child records, SDE also verifies, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements related to the findings of noncompliance. For a LEA to be considered to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, any area of noncompliance identified through a SEA review must have a subsequent compliance PLOP of 100%. Compliance PLOPs below 100% will require further review of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures to identify root causes. Verification of the LEA's correction and compliance with specific regulatory requirements will be conducted through a subsequent sampling of randomly selected files. The number of files selected will be 30%, but no less than 3, of the total number of files used to verify the district is meeting the specific regulatory requirements.

If a district has less than 3 files, the SDE will review the available files, note that no further Part B eligible students were available, and work with the LEA to ensure on going compliance in the identified area.

Consistent with OSEP memorandum 09-02, all instances of noncompliance, found through the State's on-site monitoring system, other monitoring procedures, review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through the State data system, and by the Department are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool, except for noncompliance found through the dispute resolution process. A separate database is used for tracking the correction and verification of dispute resolution findings. It is important to note, that all instances of noncompliance, including those identified through dispute



## **Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

resolution, are found and verified as corrected at the individual student level and district level as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, by verifying that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements related to the findings of noncompliance (e.g. as needed, change or require the LEA to change its policies, procedures and/or practices, to ensure implementation of the specific requirements).

Notice, in writing, is sent to each LEA that includes the citation of the statute or regulation, a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data (including percentage levels of compliance) supporting the State's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation, and the requirement that noncompliance is to be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification, which is the date of written notification. The LEA and SDE collaborate to determine the root cause and design a plan for correction that may include, if needed, change to policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to, or resulted in, noncompliance. All districts will receive written notification of noncompliance within 90 days of discovery.

Following the implementation of the plan for correction, SDE staff conducts an on-site follow-up review to verify correction of the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. SDE staff verifies correction of the individual instances of noncompliance for each LEA onsite. Verification of correction of noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement that is not subject to a specific timeline includes verifying through file reviews that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Verification of correction of noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement that is subject to a specific timeline includes verifying through file reviews that the LEA has provided the required action (i.e. evaluation, IEP or service), although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition, SDE staff review updated data to ensure that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements including a check to see if the most recent time specific items are compliant such as 60-day Timeline and Early Childhood Transition. After verification has occurred, the SDE staff enters a statement indicating such within the Compliance Tracking Tool, which then sends the LEA, in written form, confirmation that noncompliance, has been verified as corrected. SDE's method for verifying correction is consistent with guidance provided in OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and the September 3, 2008 Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance.

All years of the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) includes the following activities:

- Enter Improvement Activities Into The Compliance Tracking Tool
- CCV File Reviews
- 60 Day Timeline Data collection
- Discipline Data collection
- Early Childhood Transition Data collection

### **FOCUSED MONITORING**

Focused Monitoring is a process that purposefully selects priority areas to examine for compliance/results while not specifically examining other areas for compliance to maximize resources, emphasize important variables, and increase the probability of improved results. Districts are selected to receive Focused Monitoring based on a Determination level of "Needs Intervention" or "Needs Substantial Intervention". Determinations are a process established by IDEA 2004 and consistent with Federal Regulations. Idaho's Determinations include all compliance indicators and may also include performance indicators.

Focused Monitoring is planned and carried out by the SDE with the cooperation of the district. The purpose of the process is to help address identified needs in a focused manner for increased compliance and performance. Focused Monitoring occurs annually for identified districts based on their determination

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

level. Such districts will receive Focused Monitoring that may include an onsite visit or an alternate format, depending on the needs.

### SANCTIONS

Sanctions are reserved by the SDE for situations when a LEA has failed to correct noncompliance within 365 days from written notification. Within the Compliance Tracking Tool, a section designated as Sanctions will be used for noncompliance that has not been corrected by the LEA. Notices denoting sanctions are sent out through the Compliance Tracking Tool for those items of noncompliance not corrected in 365 days from written notification to the LEA Director of Special Education, with hard copies of the notice also sent to the District Superintendent and the District Chairman of the School Board. The SDE will then enter the required improvement activities into the Compliance Tracking Tool for the LEA, which will include the amount allocated from the LEA's Part B allocation that is directed to be used for the activities listed. The LEA will have a time period of 30 days from this notification to correct and verify the remaining issues of noncompliance.

In the event the LEA is unable to comply, or they do not comply, within 30 days, the LEA will respond within 10 days with a rationale as to why compliance is not achievable within 30 additional days and submit a plan for compliance with timelines, subject to SEA approval. If the LEA is unable to submit a plan for compliance, the LEA may be subject to withholding of funds for continuing noncompliance.

### Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued</b> Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance</b> Identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.				
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school, and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued</b> Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance</b> Identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4.A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
4B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued</b> Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance</b> Identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
5. Percent of children with IEPs, aged 6 through 21 - educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
6. Percent of preschool children, aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued</b> Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance</b> Identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	40	40	40
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	9	9	9
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth, aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	24	109	109
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued</b> Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance</b> Identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
<b>Other</b>				
Confidentiality Related Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	10	10	10
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Evaluation Related Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	94	95	95
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	4	4	4
Eligibility Related Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	135	228	228
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued</b> Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance</b> Identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
IEP Process Related Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	135	626	626
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	20	20	20
Secondary Transition Related Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	135	309	309
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	3	3	3
Early Childhood Transition Related Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	9	9	9
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued</b> Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance</b> Identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
Special Education Procedures	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	7	7	7
Placement/LRE Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	2	2	2
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>1471</b>	<b>1471</b>
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100. $(b) / (a) \times 100 = 100\%$				

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009, FFY 2010 and FFY 2011:**

The State of Idaho met the 100% target for this indicator. In a review of FFY 2009, FFY 2010, and FFY 2011 issues as required by the OSEP March 9, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) all district provided data indicating systemic corrections for issues identified in FFY 2009, FFY 2010, and FFY 2011 as required by OSEP Memo 09-02. In all other reviews of FFY 2009, FFY 2010 and FFY 2010, the SDE was able to verify 150 of 150 districts and their corrections by reviewing additional district data that demonstrated that each district was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§ 300.320(b) and 300.321 and



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

OSEP memorandum 09-02. These data were collected through an Excel workbook and review of subsequent student records to verify the data reported.

### **Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected** *(corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):*

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	<b>1434</b>
2. Number of findings the State verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	<b>1434</b>
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline.	<b>0</b> <b>100%</b>

### **Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected** *(corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):*

4. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	<b>1471</b>
5. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	<b>1471</b>
6. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b> <b>100%</b>

### **Verification of Correction Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02:**

Consistent with OSEP memorandum 09-02, all instances of noncompliance, found through the State's on-site monitoring system, other monitoring procedures, review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through the State data system, and by the Department are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool, except for noncompliance found through the dispute resolution process. A separate database is used for tracking the correction and verification of dispute resolution findings.

Notice, in writing, is sent to each LEA that includes the citation of the statute or regulation, a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data (including percentage levels of compliance) supporting the State's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation, and the requirement that noncompliance is to be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification, which is the date of written notification. The LEA and SDE collaborate to determine the root cause and design a plan for correction that may include, if needed, change to policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to, or resulted in, noncompliance.

Following the implementation of the plan for correction, SDE staff conducts an on-site follow-up review to verify correction of the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. SDE staff verifies correction of the individual instances of noncompliance for each LEA onsite. Verification of correction of noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement that is not subject to a specific timeline includes verifying through file reviews that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Verification of correction of noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement that is subject to a specific timeline includes verifying through

## **Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

file reviews that the LEA has provided the required action (i.e. evaluation, IEP or service), although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition, SDE staff review subsequent data to ensure that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements including a check to see if the most recent time specific items are compliant such as 60-day Timeline and Early Childhood Transition. After verification has occurred, the SDE staff enters a statement indicating such within the Compliance Tracking Tool, which then sends the LEA, in written form, confirmation that noncompliance has been verified as corrected. SDE's method for verifying correction is consistent with guidance provided in OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and the September 3, 2008 Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance.

All instances of noncompliance, found through the State's dispute resolution system are entered into the Dispute/Resolution Database at the student level. The database tracks timelines, corrective actions, as well as documentation of the evidence required as specified in the compliance action plans such as training, file reviews, updated data demonstrating compliance etc. Within required timelines that are generally less than, and in no case longer than, one year from the identification of the noncompliance, written notice is sent and verification is conducted by the SDE staff.

### **Verification of correction for findings of noncompliance**

#### **Indicator 11**

All instances of noncompliance were verified as corrected at the individual student level and at the district level. that each of the 40 LEAs with a non-compliance identified in FFY 2010 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), by analyzing subsequent data and verifying 100% compliance with this specific regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

In FFY 2010, for Indicator 11, there were 40 findings of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures and no dispute resolution findings of noncompliance.

#### **Indicator 12**

In FFY 2010, for Indicator 12, there were 9 findings of noncompliance from nine LEAs identified through monitoring procedures and no dispute resolution findings of noncompliance. By reviewing data from all 9 LEAs the SDE verified all individual instances of noncompliance were corrected within one year. That is, an IEP was developed and implemented, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child was no longer with the jurisdiction. Additionally, the SDE verified that each of the 9 LEAs with non-compliance identified in FFY 2010 is implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) by analyzing subsequent data and verifying 100% compliance with this specific regulatory requirement.

Consistent with OSEP memorandum 09-02, all instances of noncompliance, found through the State's on-site monitoring system, other monitoring procedures, review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through the State data system, and by the Department are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool, except for noncompliance found through the dispute resolution process.

#### **Indicator 13**

Instances of noncompliance identified in Indicator 13 were found and verified as corrected at the individual student level and at the district level. All of the 109 instances of noncompliance identified in FFY2010 were verified as corrected at the individual student level. we verified that each of the 24 LEAs with noncompliance with Indicator 13 was correctly implementing this specific regulatory requirement by

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

analyzing subsequent data and verifying 100% compliance with this specific requirement in 34 CFR §300. 320, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State reported that it timely corrected 1434 of 1434 findings identified in FFY 2009. However, OSEP's March 9, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit Letter found that the following State practices were inconsistent with the IDEA and OSEP Memo 09-02: the State has not been verifying correction of noncompliance by ensuring that each LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected, following the issuance of a written finding, through on-site monitoring or the State's data system. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance. Accordingly, OSEP recalculated the State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator to be 1.26%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The SDE verifies that all LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and FFY 2009: (1) are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring; and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Above, the SDE has described the specific actions taken to verify corrections. Additional improvement activities have been conducted (as reported below and in the revised SPP) and additional improvement activities have been planned.</p> <p>Please refer to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in this APR for additional discussion of compliance verification.</p>

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
2011	<p>1. Continue to work with various stakeholders to effectively implement the Compliance Tracking Tool.</p> <p>a. Provide on-going technical assistance for use of compliance tracking tool.</p> <p>b. Work with user-group to determine and implement improvements to data collection, reporting functions, and accessibility.</p> <p>c. Revisit the user manual and associated training.</p> <p>Collaborate with required staff to ensure compatibility of changes to state wide data systems.</p>	On-going	<p>1a. Trainings developed on the Compliance Tracking Tool to train on data entry, data analysis, and progress monitoring will be developed into a user manual. This is an ongoing process as Compliance Tracking Tool is "fine-tuned".</p> <p>1b. Collaboration between user group and stakeholder groups was used to determine if any improvements in data collection, reporting functions, and accessibility</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

			<p>were needed.</p> <p>1c. Trainings developed on the Compliance Tracking Tool to train on data entry, data analysis, and progress monitoring are updated, archived, and put on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website.</p>
2011	<p>2. Work with various work groups to support the development and implementation of changes to the CIMS process (monitoring)</p> <p>a. Deliver training and materials on the Idaho CIMS process and each component as necessary</p> <p>b. Collaborate with other federal programs to implement partnerships in reporting requirements, Continuous Improvement Plans (CIP), and monitoring</p> <p>c. Collaborate with Idaho Training Clearinghouse and the SDE webmaster to make resources and materials available and accessible</p> <p>d. Facilitate and evaluate the use of monitoring cohorts for on-site Focused Monitoring, Integrated Reviews, and Child Count Verification</p> <p>e. Implement the use of an Evaluation Process/Tool for the CIMS process that involves various stakeholders, including SEAP</p>	On-going	<p>The CIMS cycle was evaluated and revised in accordance with OSEP's March 9, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit Letter.</p> <p>A new monitoring manual was written and submitted to OSEP for review.</p> <p>All materials were posted on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse.</p> <p>Training was completed with all school districts and programs concerning file reviews and general supervision monitoring activities. Schedules have been posted on the SDE website (<a href="http://www.sde.idaho.gov/si/special_edu/">http://www.sde.idaho.gov/si/special_edu/</a>)</p>
2011	<p>3. Support districts to follow established procedures for identification and correction of noncompliance no later than 365 days</p> <p>a. Provide technical assistance for districts around compliance items in the monitoring priority areas (Eligibility &amp; the IEP Process, etc.)</p> <p>b. Provide technical assistance to districts based on the needs determined through the determination levels process</p>	On-going	<p>3a. TA materials have been developed and delivered based on the monitoring process data pulled from the Compliance Tracking Tool.</p> <p>3b. TA continues to be given for all areas of need for the LEAs.</p> <p>3c. Determination levels were issued with specific guidelines for actions and rewards.</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Implement the actions (rewards and sanctions) for districts as determined by the determination levels process</li> <li>d. Support “Best Practices Cohorts” and “District to District Mentoring” in line with the Determination Level Actions and the decisions of that work group</li> <li>e. Provide technical assistance to districts on analysis of data, review of improvement strategies, and the Performance Responses</li> <li>f. Collaborate with Building Capacity group and other programs/coordinators to identify effective strategies to support LEAs, incorporate systems level supports that will improve noncompliance. (Response to Intervention, Limited English Proficiency, Parent Involvement, etc.).</li> </ul>		<p>3d. Best practice programs and mentors continue to be identified and offered as TA support options for districts.</p> <p>3e. Training and TA on data analysis has been given and supported by SDE staff.</p> <p>3f. Collaboration across programs to identify strategies for districts that improve monitoring data has been ongoing in such things as development of the SLD criteria and extensive training within the department on effective strategies for LEP and Response to Intervention.</p>
2011	4. Onsite visits based on monitoring process including priority areas.	On-going	<p>SDE staff reviewed monitoring data, for both the monitoring process and the monitoring priorities of Secondary Transition and LRE, with LEAs to determine if noncompliance was based policy, practices, or procedures and provided TA to support correction in addition to verification of correction of the noncompliance.</p> <p>Reviews of FFY 2009, 2010, and 2011 issues were completed between September 1, 2012 and December 21, 2012 as directed in the OSEP’s March 9, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit Letter and APR/SPP Response Table.</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):**

<b>Additional Improvement Activities for Indicator # 15 have been added to the SPP</b>				
<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>2012</b>	Onsite visits based on monitoring process including priority areas.	On going	Quality Assurance Coordinator Regional Consultants VI-B Funds	Assurances districts are correcting findings of noncompliance in a timely manner and entering improvement and correction activities in the Compliance Tracking Tool.
<b>2012</b>	Continue to work with various stakeholders to effectively implement the compliance tracking tool  d. Provide on-going technical assistance for use of compliance tracking tool  e. Work with user group to determine and implement improvements to data collection, reporting functions, and accessibility  f. Revisit the user manual and associated training  Collaborate with required staff to ensure compatibility of changes to state wide data systems	On going	Quality Assurance Coordinator Regional Consultants User Group IT Dept SDE VI-B Funds	Replacement of CTT with version 2 to take place February or March 2012. Training will be required to use the new tool specific to entry of improvement activities, documentation of corrections, and approvals at both the Prong II (individual) and Prong I (system) levels.  A written user manual will provide immediate directions to LEA and SDE users.
<b>2012</b>	Work with various work groups to support the development and implementation of changes to the CIMS process (monitoring)  f. Deliver training and materials on the Idaho CIMS process and each component as necessary  g. Collaborate with other	Ongoing	SDE Director of Special Education Early Childhood & Interagency Coordinator Special Populations Coordinator Secondary Special Education Coordinator Quality Assurance and	Because of changes in the Idaho CIMS process, targeted and ongoing training will be needed to assure all LEAs understanding new requirements, participate/submit required files and/or data accurately and in a timely manner.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	<p>federal programs to implement partnerships in reporting requirements, Continuous Improvement Plans (CIP), and monitoring</p> <p>h. Collaborate with Idaho Training Clearinghouse and the SDE webmaster to make resources and materials available and accessible</p> <p>i. Facilitate trainings with all LEAs to assure understanding of new processes for on-site Focused Monitoring, Integrated Reviews, and Child Count Verification</p> <p>Implement the use of an Evaluation Process/Tool for the CIMS process that involves various stakeholders, including SEAP</p>		<p>Reporting Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators</p> <p>Idaho Training Clearinghouse</p> <p>SDE Webmaster</p> <p>VI-B Funds</p>	
<b>2012</b>	<p>Support districts to follow established procedures for identification and correction of noncompliance no later than 365 days</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide technical assistance for districts around compliance items in the monitoring priority areas (Eligibility &amp; the IEP Process, etc.)</li> <li>• Provide technical assistance to districts based on the needs determined through the determination levels process</li> <li>• Implement the actions (rewards and sanctions) for districts as determined by the determination levels process</li> </ul>	Ongoing	<p>Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinator</p> <p>Special Education SDE Staff</p> <p>Idaho Training Clearinghouse</p> <p>VI-B Funds</p>	<p>Provide ongoing training and emails to assure compliance with specific regulatory requirements as per the updated Monitoring Manual.</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support “Best Practices Cohorts” and “District to District Mentoring” in line with the Determination Level Actions and the decisions of that work group</li> <li>• Provide technical assistance to districts on analysis of data, review of improvement strategies, and the Performance Responses</li> </ul> <p>Collaborate with Building Capacity group and other programs/coordinators to identify effective strategies to support LEAs, incorporate systems level supports that will improve noncompliance. (Response to Intervention, Limited English Proficiency, Parent Involvement, etc.).</p>			
<b>2012</b>	<p>Replace current Compliance Tracking Tool with new tool</p> <p>Provide training on the use of the new CCT</p>	February through November 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator IT Program Designers Part B funds	Replacement of the CTT is required to track LEA compliance with specific regulatory requirements specific to timely correction of Prong II (individual) and Prong I (system) activities.
<b>2012</b>	Audit of data uploads	May through December 2013	Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator  EdFacts Data Manager  Part B funds	To assure accurate data collection, cross validations is needed on data uploads (Indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12), ISEE, and EdFacts submissions.



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 16:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline, or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

This indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR. States report data on the timeliness of State complaint decisions as part of the data they submit under IDEA section 618.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 17:** Percent of adjudicated due-process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party, or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (B))

This indicator has been deleted from the SPP/APR. States report data on the timeliness of State complaint decisions as part of the data they submit under IDEA section 618.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 18:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution sessions or settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

$3/8(100) = 37.5\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011	States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.	N/A due to “n” size.

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2010:**

No revisions to proposed targets/improvement activities/timelines/resources were identified in the 2009 APR for FFY 2010.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:**

**See Indicator 19 for Improvement Activities.**

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 19:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

$2 + 19 / 23 = .913 (100) = 91.3\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for FFY 2011
2011	75-85%	91.3% (21 out of 23)

Mediation		#	%
1. Mediations held		23	
a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	2		
b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	19		
2. Mediation agreements		21	91.3%

#### Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

**Slippage:** During FFY 2011, 91.3% (21 out of 23) mediations resulted in agreements, a decrease over the 94.0% reported in FFY 2010. The measurable and rigorous target was met. For the second consecutive year, the number of cases increased. In FFY 2009, Idaho had seven (7) mediations (100% agreement rate), in FFY 2010 the number of cases increased to 18 (94% agreement rate), and in FFY 2011 there were 23 cases (91.3% agreement).

#### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2010:

No revisions to proposed targets/improvement activities/timelines/resources were identified in the 2010 APR for FFY 2011.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 for Indicators 18 and 19:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>2011</b>	Continue to encourage the appropriate use of mediation	Ongoing July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012	The SDE received 65 requests for facilitations and 34 requests for mediation in SY 2011-2012.  Promoted facilitation and mediation to districts and parent groups in presentations throughout 2011-2012, including offering facilitated resolution meetings for due process hearings
<b>2011</b>	Continue to provide technical assistance to parents and districts regarding collaborative dispute resolution.	Ongoing July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012	The Dispute Resolution Coordinator offers workshops and consultation to both districts and parents.  <b><u>Sept. 2011</u></b> SDE/DR Presentation to the Idaho Mediation Association  <b><u>Sept. 2011</u></b> SDE/DR Presentation to update Parent Advisory Panel (SEAP)  <b><u>Sept. 2011</u></b> , SDE/DR Presentation to SPED Director Webinar  <b><u>Jan., 2012</u></b> , SDE/DR Presentation to SPED Director Webinar  <b><u>March, 2012</u></b> SDE/DR Presentation to IASEA State Conf. (Special Education Professionals)  <b><u>April, 2011</u></b> Training at Regional Sped Director meeting  The office fields over 75 TA calls a month from parents, parent advocates, and districts.
<b>2011</b>	Continue to provide legal updates for contracted dispute resolution personnel to keep them abreast of current case law and important IDEA issues	Ongoing July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012	Mediators are provided subscriptions to <i>LRP</i> and the <i>Special Educator</i> .  SDE/DR Forward Cases and articles to Mediators relevant to current SPED issues

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>2011</b>	Provide ongoing learning opportunities for dispute resolution contractors	Ongoing	<p><b><u>Sept 2011</u></b> Sent 6 Mediators to Law Conf.</p> <p><b><u>October, 2011</u></b>: Launched Mediator training and information web portal for discussions and sharing of materials</p> <p>Four Webinars were offered through CADRE or DR Office</p>
<b>2011</b>	Report activities and encourage input from State Advisory Panel	Ongoing Quarterly	Reports are made at each Special Education Advisory Panel meeting.
<b>2011</b>	Provide options for informal dispute resolution at the request of districts and/or parents	As needed	The SDE received 65 requests for facilitations and 34 requests for mediation in SY 2011-2012.
<b>2011</b>	Report dispute resolution data to the public via SDE and IPUL websites	Annually	The Dispute Resolution Coordinator provided biannual reports which have been posted on the SDE and IPUL websites.
<b>2011</b>	Recruit cadre of new mediators	August, 2012	Not met: Determined that current number of mediators were sufficient for Idaho activity after recruitment in 2010
<b>2011</b>	Provide professional development opportunities for mediators and other dispute resolution contractors with onsite training and mentoring activities	November 2010 and Ongoing	<p>Annual training was provided and ongoing mentoring was provided as needed. Offer mentorship opportunities for mediators. Additional trainings and calls are made as issues arise.</p> <p><b><u>November, 2011</u></b>: Mediators joined in the SDE advanced facilitation training</p> <p><b><u>Spring, 2012</u></b>: Actively Promoted CADRE Webinars/Materials: March 14, 2012; April, 2012;</p>

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

**FFY 2012 Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicators 18 and 19:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Report dispute resolution data to the public via SDE and IPUL websites	Annually	Dispute Resolution Coordinator	Meets SDE inclusionary needs and promotes transparency and accountability
2012	Provide professional development opportunities for mediators and other dispute resolution contractors with onsite training and mentoring activities	November 2012 and Ongoing	Dispute Resolution Coordinator Title VI-B funds	Informed contractors make better decisions in the field. Building a close network among SDE contracted mediators helps improve practice
2012	Continue to provide legal updates for contracted dispute resolution personnel to keep them abreast of current case law and important IDEA issues	Ongoing	Dispute Resolution Coordinator Title VI-B funds	Informed contractors make better decisions in the field.
2012	Continue to encourage the appropriate use of mediation	Ongoing	Dispute Resolution Coordinator Title VI-B funds	Mediation, as compared to complaints can improve relationships and often can better meet the interests of parties
2012	Continue to provide technical assistance to parents and districts regarding collaborative dispute resolution.	Ongoing	Dispute Resolution Coordinator Title VI-B funds	Being available for consultation helps parties resolve concerns at the lowest level appropriate
2012	Report activities and encourage input from State Advisory Panel	Ongoing Quarterly	Dispute Resolution Coordinator	Encouraging feedback from State Advisory Panel improves the provision of DR services to constituents

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2012	Provide options for informal dispute resolution at the request of districts and/or parents	As needed	Dispute Resolution Coordinator Title VI-B funds	Outreach encourages parties to utilize resources available to resolve disputes at the lowest level appropriate
------	--	-----------	--	--



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 20:** State reported data (618, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

Idaho is electing not to report data for this indicator and will await OSEP's calculation the State's data for this indicator. Idaho understands it will have an opportunity to review and respond to OSEP's calculation of the State's data.

#### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011:

FFY	Activities	Timelines	Activity Status
2011	Continued and ongoing collaboration with IT in the development of the longitudinal data system. Revise, replace and add validation checks so that data errors are corrected prior to submission.	January 2012 – December 2012	The Quality Assurance & Reporting Coordinator, Funding & Accountability Coordinator, and IT staff worked to revise the ISEE for validation as errors were identified. 135 contacts were made in the calendar year.
2011	Work with IT to create reports needed to identify possible data submission errors. Contact districts with curious data and ensure appropriate corrections are made prior to federal reporting due dates.	January 2012 – December 2012	Multiple reports were requested and run to compare data identify submission errors. The Quality Assurance & Reporting Coordinator, Funding & Accountability Coordinator, and IT staff worked with districts to correct errors. Coding changes were made to prevent upload errors.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

<b>2011</b>	Collaborate with IT to incorporate special education data collections into ISEE	January 2012 – December 2012	Business requirements were identified and documented for data elements needed for Indicators 4, 11, and 12. These data collections were integrated into the ISEE system on July 1, 2012.
<b>2011</b>	Identify and address state data system modifications as data requirements change across all data uploads with focused monitoring for indicators 5, 9, and 10.	March 2012 – December 2012	Review was completed in March 2012. No modifications were identified.
<b>2011</b>	Meet weekly to review data upload programs are being coordinated between IT personnel, the Funding and Accountability Coordinator, and the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator	January 2012 – December 2012	Weekly discussions took place via both face-to-face meetings and via email as needed.
<b>2011</b>	Monitor and cross check, using special education data uploads and the Idaho Enrollment and Staffing Information to track accurate reporting of race/ethnicity with a focus on data collected for Indicators 4, 5, 9, and 10	July 2012 – December 2012	Monitoring activities were conducted and accuracy in reporting race/ethnicity was much improved.

**FFY 2012 Improvement Activities with Justification/Timelines/Resources:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Improvement Activities</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Justification</b>
2012	Collaborate with IT to promptly respond to data information requests and provide data notes.	Dec 2012 March 2013	SDE Quality Assurance & Reporting Coordinator  SDE Technology Services  Part B Funds	Required to assure timely submission and accuracy of data being reported by districts

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011**

2012	Collaborate with IT to incorporate all special education data collections into ISEE	Aug. 2012	SDE Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator SDE Technology Services  Part B Funds	Required to assure accuracy of data being reported by districts
2012	Identify and address state data system modifications as data requirements change.	March 2013	SDE Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator SDE Technology Services Part B Funds	Required to assure accuracy of data being reported by districts
2012	Collaborate with Public School Finance and IT to ensure accuracy in ESEA data for the special education subgroup.	February 2013 – December 2013	SDE Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator  SDE Technology Services Part B Funds	Required to assure timely submission and accuracy of data being reported by districts